



Speaker's
Hon.

Washington, D.C. June 10th 1889

Col. W. G. Farrell,
Sir:

We have examined this volume entitled "An Appeal to the American people as a jury" Compiled by you, published by Belford, Belaskie & Co., and containing the Speeches made by us in the House of Representatives on this Tariff; and we state that the Speeches are correctly presented, and their publication in this form was authorized by us.

Ben Rittenworth
S. C. Cox
Wm D. Miller
J. C. Burrows
H. A. Smith.

J. C. Carlin
R. D. Mitty
J. W. Reed
Benton McMillin
Wm H. Kinsley Jr
Wm L. Wilson

EC
325a

AN APPEAL
TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
AS A JURY

SPEECHES ON THE TARIFF

IN THE

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN
THE GREAT DEBATE, APRIL 17—MAY 19, 1888

Specially selected from Both Sides

CAREFULLY REVISED AND PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

COMPILED BY

WILLIAM G. TERRELL

PUBLISHERS

BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.

CHICAGO, NEW YORK, AND SAN FRANCISCO

8-86,800

COPYRIGHTED, 1888,
By BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.

11064
9/12/90

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Hon. Roger Q. Mills, of Texas (Democratic side).....	3
Hon. Thomas B. Reed, of Maine (Republican side).....	33
Hon. Benton McMillin, of Tennessee (Democratic side).....	58
Hon. William McKinley, Jr., of Ohio (Republican side).....	86
Hon. William L. Wilson, of West Virginia (Democratic side).....	134
Hon. Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan (Republican side).....	163
Hon. William L. Scott, of Pennsylvania (Democratic side).....	196
Hon. Benjamin Butterworth, of Ohio (Republican side).....	240
Hon. Samuel S. Cox, of New York (Democratic side).....	280
Hon. William D. Kelley, of Pennsylvania (Republican side).....	343
Hon. John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky (Democratic side).....	372

HON. ROGER Q. MILLS, OF TEXAS.

(Democratic Side.)

Both of the great political parties now represented in the Government have by repeated and authoritative declarations condemned the condition of our laws which permit the collection from the people of unnecessary revenues, and have in the most solemn manner promised its correction: and neither as citizens nor partisans are our countrymen in a mood to condone the deliberate violation of these pledges. :

GROVER CLEVELAND.

No matter who may desert or who may falter, the great fight for reform will go on. This country does not belong to either the monopolists or the communists, and the people will save it from both.

JOHN G. CARLISLE.

Of all the false pretenses with which protection mocks its victims, the assumption that labor is helped or protected by taxing its earnings is the flimsiest.

WILLIAM R. MORRISON.

Mr. MILLS said:

Mr. Chairman: During our late civil war the expenditures required by an enormous military establishment made it necessary that the burdens of taxation should be laid heavily in all directions authorized by the Constitution. The internal-revenue and direct taxes were called into requisition to supplement the revenues arising from customs, to aid the Treasury to respond to the heavy demands which were being daily made upon it. The duties on imports were raised from an average on dutiable goods of 18.84 per cent. in 1861, to an average of 40.29 per cent. on dutiable goods during the five years from 1862 to 1866, inclusive. This was recognized at the time as an exceptionally heavy burden. It was stated by the distinguished gentleman who then presented to the House the bill so largely increasing the duties, and which to-day bears his honored name, that it was demanded by the exigencies of war and must cease on the return of peace. In his own words he said: "This is intended as a war measure, a temporary measure, and we must as such give it our support."

More than twenty years have elapsed since the war ended. A

generation has passed away and a new generation has appeared on the stage since peace has returned to bless our common country; but these war taxes still remain; and they are heavier to-day than they were on an average during the five years of the existence of hostilities. The average rate of duty during the last five years, from 1883 to 1887, inclusive, on dutiable goods amounts to 44.51 per cent., and during the last year the average is 47.10 per cent. Instead of the rate of taxation being reduced to meet the wants of an efficient administration of government in time of peace, it continues to grow and fill the coffers of the Government with money not required for public purposes, and which rightfully should remain in the pockets of the people.

After Congress had so largely increased the duties on imports, and thus bestowed most liberal and generous bounties on our manufacturers, a light internal tax was imposed on the products of domestic manufacture to help the Government meet the heavy demands of war. The internal tax imposed on home manufactures was but a tithe of the heavy burden imposed on the people by the increased duties on foreign goods. It brought to the Treasury in 1866 \$127,000,000—a sum which was less than 5 per cent. upon the value of the manufactured product of that year. It was thought not to be unreasonable to require this small contribution from those whose bounty Congress had increased from 18 to 40 per cent. in the price of their products.

But, Mr. Chairman, that tax is gone. It could not be retained. It was a tax on wealth. It came out of the pockets of the manufacturer. As soon as the war was ended complaint was made that this tax was a war tax, that it was no longer necessary, and it was repealed. Congress imposed a tax on incomes, too, to help the Government to meet the expenditures of war. It brought to the Treasury, in 1866, \$72,000,000. The official reports showed that four hundred and sixty thousand one hundred and seventy persons out of the whole population had incomes above the exemption, and they had \$707,000,000 of net annual income, while the balance of the people had nothing beyond what was required for annual support. Yet scarcely had the war ended until this tax was declared to be exceedingly odious, inquisitorial, and oppressive; and Congress was asked to repeal it, and it is gone.

Congress thought it was unjust to require 460,170 persons who had an annual income of \$707,000,000 to pay anything to support the Government, and they hurriedly swept that "odious" measure from the statute-book. Besides these there were taxes on the receipts of railroad companies, taxes on insurance companies, taxes on express

companies, taxes on bank capital, bank deposits, and bank checks, but they are gone. Congress lent a willing ear to the demands of wealthy corporations and individuals and took all the burden from them, but the war taxes on clothing, like the poor, we have always with us. These taxes were given up at a time when our interest-bearing debt of more than \$2,000,000,000 was staring us in the face and demanding from the Government more than \$140,000,000 annually to meet its interest.

With these facts before their eyes they made haste to roll all the burdens of taxation off the shoulders of the wealthy and lay them upon the shoulders of those who could only pay as they procured the means by their daily toil. Could not that \$127,000,000 contributed by the manufacturers from the rich bounties which the Government had given have been retained until the war debt was paid? Could not the \$72,000,000 from incomes have been held for a few years longer? Could not the tax on the receipts of the wealthy corporations have been continued for one decade?

If these taxes had been kept ten years longer we would to-day have no national debt, and in addition to the moderate reductions now proposed we could give back to the people the hundred millions now required to pay its interest and sinking fund. Upon what economic principle or principle of justice were these taxes repealed and the whole burden laid on articles going into daily consumption, and which must be obtained by the labor of mind and muscle?

Was the tax of 3 per cent. on the domestic blanket paid by the manufacturer more oppressive than the tax of 79 per cent. on both foreign and domestic blankets paid by the people?

Was the tax of 3 per cent. on a wool hat paid by the manufacturer more oppressive than the tax of 73 per cent. on both paid by the consumer? Was the tax of 3 per cent. on women's and children's clothing paid by the manufacturer more oppressive than the tax of 82 per cent. on both foreign and domestic goods of the same kind paid by the consumer? Was a tax of 3 per cent. on railroad companies, banking companies, insurance companies, express and telegraph companies, more oppressive than an 88 per cent. tax on woolen shawls? Was a 3 per cent. tax on incomes more oppressive than an 80 per cent. tax on a woolen shirt?

The party then in power certainly thought so, for the taxes on wealth are gone, but the war tax on clothing, the war tax on food, the war tax on the implements of labor still remain with us, and the war against our prosperity, our labor, and our commerce is still being vigorously prosecuted—a war that is exhausting in its

destructive invasions on labor, whether it is employed in agriculture, manufactures, commerce, or mining. Every effort that has been made to bring this war on the industries of the country to an end and to restore the Government to the peace establishment has been resisted at every step, and so far every effort to end this unjustifiable invasion of the rights of the people has been defeated.

The gentlemen who represent the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means boast that they have reduced taxation \$360,000,000. They point with pride to the splendid column which they have erected, but that column has no stone in it to tell of their devotion to the masses who live by daily toil. It is built of blocks of marble, every one of which speaks of favoritism to the wealthy, of special privileges to rich and powerful classes. In 1883 they finished this magnificent shaft, which they have been for years erecting, and crowned it with the last stone by repealing the internal tax on playing-cards and putting a 20 per cent. tax on the Bible.

We on this side of the House have been trying to reduce taxation on the necessities of life to the people, and so far without success. The minority of the committee charge that we have accomplished nothing to compare with what they have done. That indeed would be a grave charge if the gentlemen who make it could show that their united opposition had not been thrown across our path at every step. But it does not lie in their mouths to charge this side of the House with failing to reduce taxation. Whenever we have brought bills into the House to reduce taxes on the necessities of life they have mustered nearly their entire strength to defeat us.

The members from that side who have come to our help could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Twice they have stricken out the enacting clauses of our bills to reduce taxation, and twice they have refused even to consider the question of reducing taxation on the people.

Now, sir, what has been the result of this policy? Enormous taxation upon the necessities of life has been a constant drain upon the people—taxation not only to support all the expenditures of Government, but taxation so contrived as to fill the pockets of a privileged class, and taking from the people \$5 for private purposes for every dollar that it carries to the public Treasury.

This is one of the vicious results of the war tariff. The taxes, both for public and private purposes, are paid by labor. They are assessed on labor. Now, let us see how it benefits labor, as it is claimed to do. Suppose a laborer who is earning a dollar a day by

his work finds a suit of woollen clothes that he can buy for \$10 without the tariff tax, then the suit of clothes can be procured for ten days' work; but the manufacturer comes to Congress and says, "I must be protected against the man buying this cheap suit of clothes," and Congress protects him by putting a duty of 100 per cent., or \$10 more. Now it will require the laborer to work twenty days to get his suit of clothes. Now tell me if ten days of his labor have not been annihilated? Has he not been required to work twice as long under the tariff as he would have done without to obtain his suit of clothes?

But how has that duty affected the manufacturer? If it required him to work ten days to produce the suit of clothes worth \$10, he now produces them by five days' work, for he receives \$20 for ten days' work, and, of course, \$10 for five days' work. The manufacturer has had his work reduced half, the laborer has had his increased double. But it is said that the tariff helps the laborer by doubling his pay, because it builds up manufactures everywhere. But if that is true, the tariff at the same time that it doubles the value of the manufacturer's product ought to double the value of the laborer's pay; but the tariff takes his money and puts it in the pockets of the manufacturer and pays him in promises which it never redeems.

There are woollen goods, as we have shown in the report of the committee, bearing duties from 100 to 180 per cent., but I have taken 100 per cent. for the greater ease of illustrating the effect. The benefits of the tariff all go one way. They go from the consumer to the manufacturer, but not from the manufacturer to the consumer. Suppose that the tax on the 60,000,000 of consumers amounts to \$10 per head, then it is a tax of six hundred millions; if it is only \$5 per head, it is three hundred millions taken out of the pockets of the consumer and put into the pockets of the manufacturers. The tax on the four hundred millions of goods imported goes into the public Treasury; the tax levied on domestic manufactures, by raising their price, goes into the pockets of the manufacturers.

But the excessive taxation imposed on the people is not the largest injury that it inflicts upon them.

The greatest evil that is inflicted by it is in the destruction of the values of our exports. Remember that the great body of our exports are agricultural products. It has been so through our whole history. From 75 to over 80 per cent. of the exports of this country year by year are agricultural products. Cotton is first, then breadstuffs, pork, beef, butter, cheese, lard. These

are the things that keep up our foreign trade, and when you put on or keep on such duties as we have now—war duties which were regarded as so enormous even in the very midst of hostilities that they were declared to be temporary—when you put on or retain those duties, they limit and prohibit importation, and that limits or prohibits exportation. It takes two to make a trade. All the commerce of all the countries of the world is carried on by an exchange of commodities—commodities going from the country where they are produced at the least cost to seek a market in those countries where they can either not be produced at all or where they can be produced only at the highest cost of production.

We are the great agricultural country of the world, and we have been feeding the people of Europe, and the people of Europe have got to give us in exchange the products of their labor in their shops; and when we put on excessive duties for the purpose of prohibiting the importations of their goods, as a necessary result we put an excessive duty upon the exportation of our own agricultural products. And what does that do? It throws our surplus products upon our own markets at home, which become glutted and oversupplied, and prices go down. So it is with the people of Europe who are manufacturing and producing things that we cannot produce, but which we want. Their products are thrown upon their home markets, which are glutted and oversupplied, and their prices likewise go down. And whenever, from any cause, prices start up in Europe, our tariff being levied mainly by specific duties upon quantity, not upon value, the tariff goes down, and then we see large importation and, as a result, large exportation.

Then we see a rise in agricultural products; then we see the circulation of money all through the whole of our industrial system; we see our people going to work, our manufactories starting up, and prosperity in every part of the land. Witness the history of 1880. After the long depression lasting from 1873 to 1880 prices suddenly rose in Europe. The prices of all the products which they export to us began to rise in the latter part of the year. What was the result? As prices rose there the tariff went down, the obstructions became lower, and the imports came in.

Our imports increased about \$200,000,000 in one year. What was the result of that? Our exports increased largely. The prices of wheat, of cotton, of corn, of all the products that we export went up; not only the prices of that which was exported, but also the prices of that which was consumed at home. We exported in 1880 \$685,000,000 worth of agricultural products, and in 1881 \$730,000,000. During last year we exported only \$523,000,000 worth of

agricultural products. About 15 per cent. of our agricultural products have to seek a foreign market, and in 1881 the proportion rose to 20 per cent.

I have a letter here, which I will not stop to read, from the statistician of the Agricultural Department, in which he places the value of the present crop of the United States at three billions five hundred millions, and he says that if the prices of 1880 now obtained the value of the crops would be in excess of four billion dollars. Here, then, is a loss, according to this estimate, of not less than \$500,000,000. How much greater the value of the crop would be he does not say.

But when we see the prices of agricultural products in 1881, we exported \$730,000,000 worth of agricultural products, and then compare them with 1887, when the export of agricultural products fell to \$523,000,000, we can form some estimate of the great loss of our farmers by stopping exportation. In 1881 wheat was worth \$1.19 per bushel; it is now worth 68 cents. In 1881 corn was worth 63 cents per bushel; it is now worth 44 cents. The exports of our agricultural products have fallen during the last year far below those of 1881, and the prices have correspondingly fallen.

If the prices of 1881 obtained to-day the wheat crop of 1887 would be increased over its present value \$232,000,000, and if by exportation to foreign markets we could have each year since 1881 realized the price of that year, the wheat-growers would have realized on their annual crops since then a thousand millions of dollars more than they did. In the low prices of corn since then they have lost double that. Some part of the low prices is to be attributed to large crops, but by far the greater cause is the restriction of the market for the sale of farm products.

If the tariff imposed a revenue duty sufficient to obtain money enough to support the Government but not high enough to impede importation, then our foreign trade would grow rapidly and our agricultural products would find ample markets and good prices. But just as long as we continue to stop importation by high duties, just so long will we stop exportation; and our agricultural surplus continuing to increase and its markets being limited the prices must continue low. The tariff robs the farmer on one side by increasing the prices of what he buys; it robs him on the other by decreasing the price of what he sells.

But it is insisted that if we lower the duties and let foreign goods be imported it will stop our manufactories—that it will turn our people out of employment or reduce their wages. It will do nothing of the sort. What will we import, and what did we import

when prices rose and the duties fell in 1880? We imported more of the same articles which we were importing before the prices rose. We will import more of the things we cannot produce or which can be produced cheaper in other countries than at home. If we look to our table of imports in 1880, we will see that over sixty millions of the increase was of articles in the free-list and about one hundred and twenty-five millions in the dutiable list. The increase of imports free of duty will not hurt the manufacturer or the laborer.

We always import more coffee, more tea, more of everything that is required to meet the wants of the people when prices are high, because when prices are high the country is more prosperous and the people are better able to buy and pay for what they want, and the tariff is then lower and dutiable articles are more largely imported to compete for sale with the home products. In looking through our consumption statement we see that a certain line of articles are imported from year to year; then observing the periods when prices are high and the tariff low you will see that the same articles are imported in larger quantities.

Our manufacturers do not then stop. They go on with increased activity. They did not stop in 1880 when the large importation set in. It gave them renewed life; their wheels flew faster, their machinery worked more constantly, and their operatives were all employed. Why is this? Why, Mr. Chairman, we can produce at least 90 per cent. of all the manufactures consumed in this country more cheaply at home than they can be produced anywhere in the world and delivered here. This 90 per cent. which we can produce at a lower cost than any other people can will not be hurt by importation.

I have here a letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, which shows that in 1850 with a low tariff the consumption of domestic manufactures in the United States was 88.39 per cent. of the whole, and of imports 11.61 per cent. In 1860, with a still lower tariff, our home manufacturers constituted 87.57 per cent., and the consumption of imports was 12.43 per cent. In 1870 the consumption of domestic manufactures was 93.14 per cent. and 6.86 per cent. of imports, and in 1880 were consumed 92.58 per cent. of home manufactures and 7.42 per cent. of foreign manufactures. Now, it is evident from these figures that under any circumstances we can hold 90 per cent. of the market against the world.

If we had no tariff, if all the custom-houses were torn down and the Government was supported by direct taxation, not more than 10 per cent. of all the manufactured products consumed by all the

people would be imported into the country. Senator Sherman, in a speech delivered three months ago, quoted a statement of ex-Consul Tudley, that nine-tenths of all the articles of manufacture consumed by the people could be procured as cheaply here as in England. He indorsed the statement as correct. I deny the accuracy of the statement. If he had said that nine-tenths of all the manufactures consumed in the United States could be produced more cheaply here than in England he would have been nearer the truth. If nine-tenths of all the manufactures consumed here are cheaper here than in England it is because they are produced at a lower cost. Then what objection does he see to reducing the tariff?

What use have our manufacturers for the tariff at all? Why are they constantly beseeching Congress not to ruin them by reducing the war rates? They can produce nine-tenths of their products and sell them cheaper than their rivals in England, but they do not do it. If they do sell nine-tenths of their products cheaper than English manufacturers, why is it that they and our friends on the other side not only resist every effort that we make to reduce these war taxes, but are asking now that the tariff on woolen goods shall be raised? Why are they demanding that woolen cloth shall be raised to 128 per cent., women's and children's dress goods to 102, flannels to 121 per cent., hats to 134 per cent., and knit goods to 135 per cent.? Why do they resist the reduction of the duty on steel rails to \$11 a ton? Why oppose the slight reduction we propose in cotton goods?

The manufacturer is not so much interested now in the foreign market as the farmer. Less than 2 per cent. of the \$7,000,000,000 of his annual product goes to the foreign market; but the farmer sends 15 per cent. of his products there, and would send a larger per cent. if the way was open. The manufacturer looks to the home market for the sale of 98 per cent. of his product. Then is it not a matter of the deepest concern to him to have that home market prosperous? Is not every one who sells goods interested in having customers able to purchase and pay for everything they want? Would not manufacturers make more money by selling their goods to American people with pockets full of money than to wild Indians who had none?

It is essential to the American manufacturer that he shall have a prosperous market in which there is a constant and active demand for his goods, and that he have such market both at home and abroad so that his customers may be as many as possible, that they be constantly increasing in pecuniary ability so that they can buy largely and pay promptly for all they buy. These things being true,

and his dependence being almost exclusively on the home market he should do everything in his power to help his customers grow in wealth. Who are his customers? The farmers. How are they to become prosperous and grow in wealth? By selling their products in the markets that demand them and offer for them the highest price. Where are those markets? In foreign countries. But those markets are closed to him unless Congress will let him bring back the goods he will obtain in exchange. If to-day the barriers against importation were broken down and our imports should increase from two to three hundred millions, that importation would create a demand for that amount of agricultural products to be exported to pay for them, and that would increase the price of farm products all through the land. It would distribute money among the whole sixty millions of people, placing a dollar beside every want with which it could be satisfied. He would find that he had a market then at home far more valuable to him than it would be with the 10 per cent. of importations kept out and the prices of all farm products forced down so low that the farmers would have nothing with which to buy.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is said that this will injure our labor. It is said a high tariff makes high wages for labor. It is said if we reduce the tariff wages must be reduced. How is it high tariff makes high wages for labor? How can it be explained? Why, they say, as a matter of course, if you increase the value of the domestic product, the manufacturer is able to pay higher wages. Unquestionably he is, but does he do it? No. Mr. Jay Gould, with his immense income from his railroad property, is able to pay his boot-black \$500 a day, but does he do it? Oh, no; he pays the market price of the street. He gets his boots blacked and pays his nickel like a little man. [Laughter.] Mr. Vanderbilt, from the income arising from the interest on the immense amount of bonds of the Federal Government he has got, can afford to pay his hostler \$10,000 a year. He is able to do it; his bonds enable him to do it, but does he do it? Oh, no; he goes out into the market and employs his labor at the market value, and pays the same price that the humblest citizen in New York does.

High tariff does not regulate wages. Wages are regulated by demand and supply and the capacity of the laborer to do the work for which he is employed. If high tariff regulated wages, how is it the wages in the different States of the Union are different while the tariff is all the same from Maine to California? In every part of the territory of the United States the tariff is the same. How is it the wages are not the same? How is that wages in the different locali-

ties in the different States are different? What is the cause? What is it which disturbs the tariff and prevents it from fixing a high rate of wages all over the country for labor?

We find by the census the rate of wages in the cotton industry is lower in Rhode Island than in Pennsylvania, and we find the wages in the iron business are higher in Rhode Island than in Pennsylvania. Why is that so? It is not the tariff that does it, it is the demand and supply of the people to do the work demanded of them. There are more cotton operatives in Rhode Island and the supply is greater, and therefore the wages are lower. The same thing is true about the iron business in Pennsylvania. The wages of cotton operatives in Pennsylvania are higher because there are fewer in Pennsylvania than in the State of Rhode Island. It is not the tariff that regulates the wages. Well, what is it that fixes the high rate of wages in this country?

It is admitted by all who are well informed on this subject that our rate of wages is higher than anywhere else in the world, that England is higher than France, and that the rate of wages is higher in France than in Germany. Why is this? Germany and France both have a protective tariff to guard against the free-trade labor of England. What then is it that makes higher wages? It is coal and steam and machinery. It is these three powerful agents that multiply the product of labor and make it more valuable, and high rate of wages means low cost of product. A high rate of wages means that cheap labor has got to go; and the history of our country in the last fifty years demonstrates that as clearly and as conclusively as any mathematical problem can be demonstrated.

Fifty years ago, Mr. Edward Atkinson shows, it required five persons, two carders, two spinners, and one weaver, working by the old methods, to make eight yards of cloth in one day. They got 20 cents a day; a dollar for the whole five. The labor cost of the cloth was $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents a yard, and calculating 300 working days in a year the whole product of these five cheap laborers was 2,400 yards of cloth; but when coal and steam and machinery were harnessed together to produce cloth, five persons to-day in New England produce 140,000 yards of cloth. The labor cost of the cloth is 1.03 cents per yard. The wages of labor, instead of being \$60 a year, or 20 cents a day, is \$287 per annum for each.

The result of the labor-saving machinery used was an enormous increase in productive capacity. The result of that was a great increase in the rate of wages, and the further result was a great decrease in the cost of production. The old hand-wheel and the old methods of labor have had to depart before the all-conquering march

of coal and steam and machinery. They had to go because the small amount of product of the article drove them out of the field. It is not the rate of wages, it is the article which the labor makes and the cost at which that article can be produced—the lower cost—which drives the rival article out of the market. Such is the history which has been written in our country in the last half century.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Edward Atkinson, one of the clearest thinkers and writers on political economy of the present day, in his little book on *The Distribution of Products*, lays down the principle that high rate of wages means low cost of product, and low rate of wages means high cost of product. He says that "the cheapest man is the one who works the greatest amount of machinery with the least stops." I read a paragraph from his book, on page 44:

In any given country like the United States, where the people are substantially homogeneous, where the means of intercommunication are ample, where there are no hereditary or class distinctions, and where there is no artificial obstruction to prevent commerce, high rates of wages in money will be the natural and therefore necessary result of low cost of production in labor.

Again, on page 46, he says:

Hence, it follows that although the total production of any given thing may not be concentrated at the very best point, it will yet be found to be true that where the conditions are the best, the cost, measured in terms of days of labor, will be lowest, and the wages, measured in terms of money per day, will be the highest, the high money wages being the necessary consequence of the low labor cost. Conversely, low rates of money wages are the natural and necessary result of a high labor cost of production.

Now, then, "it follows," he says, on page 56,

That the nation which has diminished the quantity of human labor in greatest measure by the application of machinery produces goods at the lowest cost, and by exchange with the hand-working nations, who still constitute the majority of the people of the world, is, by way of such exchange, enabled to pay the highest rate of wages in money, because their goods are made at the lowest labor cost.

In order to prove that fact Mr. Atkinson made an investigation into the condition of two old manufacturing houses in the State of New Hampshire; he compared two periods—1830 with the year 1884. He found that in 1830 the wages per annum were \$164 in gold to each operative. This increased until 1884, when it amounted to \$290 in gold.

Now as to the efficiency of the labor employed. In 1830 the total

number of yards of cloth produced by each operative was 4,321 per annum, while in 1884, mainly by the aid of improved machinery, it had been increased to 28,032 yards. The cost of the labor per yard was 1.9 cents in 1830, and but 1.07 cents in 1884.

Let us now reduce these differences to percentages and compare them in that form. There was, as I have shown, a great increase in the productive capacity of each operative, but there was a decrease in operatives per thousand spindles of 60 per cent.

The pound of material turned out by each spindle or operative was taken as a unit of measurement, and Mr. Atkinson's table shows that the pounds that each spindle turned out had increased 22 per cent., and the pounds that each operative turned out in a day had increased 190 per cent.; the pounds that each operative turned out per hour increased 240 per cent. The wages of operatives per hour (for the number of hours were made less) increased 240 per cent. The wages of the operative per annum had increased 64 per cent., and per hour 94 per cent., while the labor cost per yard had decreased 41 per cent. The other house showed the same condition. It showed that productive efficiency had increased in spindles 276 per cent., in pounds per operative 214 per cent., while wages increased 77 per cent., and labor cost per yard decreased 44 per cent.

This great revolution in production, wages, and cost is not the work of the tariff, but of coal, steam, and machinery. These three powerful agents have produced these marvelous results. The effects inevitably follow the cause—high rate of wages because so much more service is rendered the employer, low cost of product because so much more is done in a given time. I repeat it, the tariff has had nothing to do with bringing about the great change, and it is impotent, utterly impotent, to increase the rate of wages.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to a statement found in the report of the United States Census. This is the report in reference to the wages in the manufacturing industries of the country, and I call special attention to the report of an ax-manufacturing establishment in Connecticut on page 158. This gentleman who makes the report compares the operations of his house from his books in 1840 with 1880. In steel-fitting, in ax-making, each operative turned out 600 pieces per day in 1840. In 1880 each operative turned out 1,250 pieces per day. Each operative received in 1840 24 cents per hundred pieces, and received in 1880 20 cents per hundred pieces. He earned in 1840 \$1.44 a day, and in 1880, though he received less for each piece, he earned \$2.50 per day.

And this table includes all the different parts of the manufacture of the ax—the poll-making, rough-polishing, tempering, finishing,

grinding, painting, backing, etc.; and in every department of this manufacture in making axes the same rule is observed—that is, the increased productive power increases the wages and decreases the cost of the product. That follows as shadow follows substance, as night follows day. It is the effect following the cause. It is the cause producing the effect—that as the laborer is more efficient and more valuable to his employer, as he turns out more work, he is entitled to and receives more pay. He receives more wages by the day, even though he is paid less for each piece of work he turns out.

Now, was the increase of the daily wages of these operatives due to the tariff? Let the manufacturer answer. He says: "The following table shows the results of labor-saving machinery, together with the increase in the efficiency of labor in the manufacture of axes, from 1840 to 1880." When I saw these tables, proving the principle so clearly presented and so strongly enforced by Mr. Atkinson, I went to our very able and efficient chief of labor, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, and asked him to have a table like this in the Census Report prepared, and to send an intelligent agent into some of the oldest houses in the country and get a statement from their books and send it to me, that I might see if there was a different result in other establishments. I now give you the testimony of those houses to add to the others.

There are here seven establishments. The first one is in Massachusetts. A comparison is instituted between 1849 and 1884, and the industry is cotton print cloth. Each operative made in 1849 in this factory $44\frac{1}{2}$ yards per day; in 1884 he made 98.2 yards, an increase of productive power of 120 per cent. What wages did he get? The average daily [earnings of the laborer in 1849 were 66 cents, and in 1884 \$1. His wages increased 50 per cent. The labor cost of the product decreased 32 per cent.

In that same establishment in 1849 the wages of weavers were 65 cents a day, and each man turned out 113 yards of cloth. In 1884 the wages had risen to \$1.06, and each weaver turned out 273 yards of cloth.

In the second house, also in Massachusetts, manufacturing printed cloths, each laborer in 1850 produced 42 yards; in 1884 he produced 102 yards, an increase of 142 per cent. His earnings were 65 cents a day in 1850 and \$1.05 in 1884. The increase in wages was 61 per cent. The decrease in the labor cost of the article was 33 per cent.

The third house, manufacturing sheeting in Massachusetts, showed that each laborer in 1852 produced 41 yards and in 1886 73 yards of cloth. His productive efficiency increased 77 per cent. His wages

increased 49 per cent. The labor cost of the cloth decreased 15 per cent.

In the fourth house, in New Hampshire, manufacturing print cloth, each laborer in 1852 produced 42.5 yards and in 1886 103 yards. The increase in productive capacity was 142 per cent. The increase in wages was 56.7 per cent., and the labor cost per yard decreased 35 per cent.

Without going all through these figures the facts as to each one of these houses show in every instance that the productive efficiency of the laborer had increased, and that corresponding with that the wages had increased and the cost of the product had decreased.

Now, then, the tariff had nothing to do with any of these results. During this time we had high tariffs and low tariffs, but whether high tariff or low tariff, or no tariff, the productive efficiency continued to increase, the multiplication of production by the power of machinery continued to increase, and wages rose with it, and the cost of the product sunk. So that the tariff conferred no benefit on the laborer; none whatever.

But now let us see what effect a reduction of the duties will have by letting in the goods of England and other foreign countries into our markets to compete with our people and to endanger the laborers of our country, as it is charged it will do. I say the same proposition for which I have been contending is demonstrated again when we compare the laborer of this country with the laborer of England. We produce cheaper than in England because a high rate of wages means low cost of product, and a higher rate of wages means lower cost of product, and the highest rate of wages means lowest cost of product.

Mr. Wright, Chief of the Labor Bureau, instituted a most painstaking examination into the rates of labor in England and Massachusetts a few years ago, and showed the rates of labor higher in this country than in England: 12 per cent. higher in cotton manufacture, 25 per cent. in the manufacture of woollens, 26 per cent. in iron and steel, 128 per cent. in boots and shoes. That would seem to indicate, according to the philosophy which has been taught in this country by protectionists for many years, that we are on the road to ruin because our rate of labor is higher than in England and other countries. But the reverse of that proposition is true; and the fact that the rate of wages is higher here than in England shows that England is distanced in the great industrial contest into which she has entered.

Now let me give you an instance here in boots and shoes. If we pay so much higher wages in producing boots and shoes, if the prop-

osition we hear on the other side be true, we cannot enter into any contest with Great Britain when we pay 128 per cent. higher wages than she does. Yet we import no boots and shoes at 30 per cent. duty from England. We make the cheapest boots and shoes and the finest made in the world. In that England cannot contest with us; and the fact that the rate of wages is so much higher here than in England shows that she is far behind in the race.

Let us see. Here is a gentleman writing in Harper's Magazine in 1885, a very able article entitled "A pair of shoes." He takes the history of the hide from the cow and follows it through all its mutations into the finest products of manufacture. This is not an article on wages; but it contains a paragraph on wages.

Mr. COX. By whom is the article written?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Howard Newhall is the writer. He says:

American ladies' shoes wholesaling at \$1.50 per pair cost for labor of making 25 cents. English ladies' shoes wholesaling at \$1.50 per pair cost for labor of making 34 cents. American men's shoes wholesaling at \$2.60 per pair cost for labor of making 33 cents. English men's shoes wholesaling at \$2.60 per pair cost for labor of making 50 cents. In the report of the Massachusetts bureau of statistics for 1884 the general average weekly wage in Massachusetts is given as 128.9 per cent. higher than in Great Britain. The general average weekly wage in Massachusetts is given as \$11.63 per week, and in Great Britain \$5.08.

Now, what is the solution of all this? What does it mean? In Massachusetts wages are 128.9 per cent. higher than they are in Great Britain, but the labor cost of a pair of ladies' shoes in Massachusetts is less than the labor cost of a like pair of shoes in Great Britain. The cost is 25 cents in Massachusetts against 34 cents in England. The labor cost of men's shoes in Massachusetts is 33 cents per pair; the labor cost of men's shoes in England is 50 cents. If our people are to be injured by the importation of English shoes into this country the English shoe must be produced at a lower cost than the American shoe; otherwise it cannot take the market.

It is not the rate of wages in England and in America respectively, \$5.08 against \$11.63, that we have to consider, but it is the labor cost of the pair of shoes. Now, the man holds the market who can sell his goods cheapest, and the man can sell cheapest who gets his goods at the lowest cost, and that is the man in Massachusetts. What, then, does this difference of wages mean, \$11.63 per week in Massachusetts against \$5.08 in England? It simply means increased productive efficiency; it means that the productive efficiency of the

American workman engaged in this industry is greater than that of the British workman by 128.9 per cent.

In order for the American to earn his \$11.63 a week he makes 35 pairs of men's shoes in a week; the Englishman to earn his \$5.08 a week makes 10 pairs of men's shoes. In order for the American workman to earn his \$11.63 per week he makes 46 pairs of ladies' shoes; in order for the Englishman to earn his \$5.08 per week he makes 15 pairs of ladies' shoes. The tariff did not make the American workingman's wages \$11.63 per week. It was the number of shoes he made that regulated his wages, and superior skill in using machinery gave him the capacity to make more shoes than the Englishman.

Here is the solution of the whole question, and the principle is the same that I have been supporting all along. That principle is that the higher rate of wages means a higher productive power; it is increased pay for increased work; it is not the tariff; it is more work; it is more efficient work; it is better work; it is cheaper work. It is that that holds the market; and it holds the boot and shoe market of this country against the importation of a single pair of shoes from Great Britain, notwithstanding the fact that wages there are \$5.08 a week as against \$11.63 in Massachusetts.

Mr. HERBERT. Free hides also help you out on that point.

Mr. MILLS. England also has free hides. A few years ago, in 1879, our English friends across the water took alarm about the growth and development of our cotton industry in the United States, and they sent an expert—a gentleman thoroughly conversant with the cotton business of England—to the United States to make a thorough and searching investigation into the whole business of cotton manufacture in this country, and to report to them whether their industry was imperiled by that of the United States. That gentleman went to New England, the seat of the cotton industry in this country. He made a thorough and searching investigation, and in every instance he showed that we could produce cotton goods at a lower labor cost than they could be produced at any point in Great Britain. I have here the tabular statement that he gave to his people when he returned.

The following are the rates of wages for weaving and spinning cloths in some of the principal districts of England and America, as shown by his report:

A piece 28 inches, 56 reeds, 14 picks (?), 60 by 56, 58 yards, costs at Ashton-under-Lyne, in England, 24.68 cents to weave; in Rhode Island it costs 16.82 cents. At Blackburn, in England, it costs 25.4 cents; at Providence, R. I., it costs 17.26 cents; at Stockport, Eng-

land, 25.4 cents; at Fall River, 19.96 cents; at Hyde, England, 25.28 cents; at Lowell, 19.96 cents. In every instance the labor cost of the production of the cotton goods is lower here than in England. Now let us turn to the summary. At Fall River the wages in a pound of print cloth, about 7 yards, is 6.907 cents; at Lowell it is 6.882 cents; in Rhode Island it is 6.422; in Pennsylvania, 6.44; in England, 6.96 cents. In every place in the United States, in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, the labor cost of producing a pound of print cloth was lower than at any point in England.

A MEMBER. And the wages higher.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Then what harm does the tariff do?

Mr. MILLS. What good does it do? It enables you to make "trusts," combinations, and "pools" by keeping foreign products out of the market. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. I will answer the gentleman if he will give me the opportunity. I will tell him what good it does. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. MILLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, when we come to look at the last column of these figures the picture changes. What do we find when we come to look at the total product, with the cost of the material thrown in, and all the other elements besides labor? While the labor cost is lowest in the United States, where the rate of wages is highest, yet when we come to examine the cost of the material, England beats us, because she produces the goods at a total cost lower than ours. It is not the labor that causes this difference; it is the cost of the material. The machinery by which you run your establishments costs you 45 per cent.; your dye-stuffs are more costly than in England; all these things which enter into the manufacture of goods cost more here than on the other side. But do not charge this increased cost to labor. You are not paying the laborer, in proportion to the work that he does, as much as he receives in England.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman allow me—

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. MILLS (to Mr. BRUMM). Go ahead.

Mr. BRUMM. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the cost of cotton in England was less than the cost of cotton in this country?

Mr. MILLS. You understand me to say that the labor cost of producing a pound of print-cloth was lower in this country than in England. You understood me further to say that the total cost, including materials and everything else, is lower in England than in the United States.

Mr. BRUMM. Therefore, does not that say that cotton, being the raw

material out of which the cotton goods are made, must be lower in England than in this country?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, no; not at all; of course not.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MILLS. It means that England procures her machinery at less cost than we do ours. It means that England produces the dyes which enter into the manufacture of these goods cheaper because untaxed. That is what it means.

Mr. KELLEY. I protest against these interruptions of the gentleman's speech.

Mr. MILLS. I do not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman, as the organ of his party, is expounding its doctrine, and these interruptions are, in my judgment, impertinences. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, when we come to look at the total cost of this pound of calico cloth we find that at Fall River it is 14 cents (leaving off fractions); at Lowell, 14 cents; in Rhode Island, 11 cents; in Pennsylvania, 15 cents; in England, 12 cents. England produces the goods at a total cost less than ours, and that gives her the market; but while the goods cost more here, she pays more in the form of wages.

Now, when this gentleman goes back home after this general survey of the whole business he reports to his people elaborately. I refer to this little book published in England, given to me by my friend, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, the Chief of the Bureau of Labor. He goes back and tells his people——

Be still, sad heart, and cease repining;
Behind the clouds the sun is still shining.

These people over in the United States, while they beat us in labor, while they can produce anything in the cotton business at a labor cost cheaper than we can, are, like Ephraim, "joined to their idols." They maintain high tariff on raw materials, and therefore the cost of materials entering into their manufactures is higher than with us. It will take a great revolution to change their minds on this subject; and as long as they hold to the policy of high tariff on materials which enter into manufactures you may go to sleep in security, for England holds the markets of the world.

This is his language:

While, however, the American nation heaps duties upon the import of foreign machinery, thus increasing the price of mill construction, and in other ways by her tariff arrangements artificially raising the cost of production,

American manufactures will continue too high in price to compete with English in all but exceptional cases.

Now, this statement in regard to the cotton industry is supported by a statement from Secretary Blaine. A few years ago, while he was Secretary of State, he said in his report, in speaking of the cotton industry:

Undoubtedly the inequalities in the wages of English and American operatives are more than equalized by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor. If this should prove to be a fact in practice, as seems to be proven from official statistics, it will be a very important element in the establishment of our ability to compete with England for our share of the cotton trade of the world.

I am reading from Mr. Blaine's report on the cotton-goods trade of the world.

Mr. Charles S. Hill, statistician of the State Department, makes a statement that I think is extravagant, and I would not quote it but he is a pronounced protectionist. I would not quote it if he were a revenue reformer, because I think it is too strong.

In his argument before the Tariff Commission he says that our manufacturing product in 1882 was \$8,000,000,000, made by 5,250,000 hands, and that for the same time the product of England was \$4,000,000,000, made by 5,140,200 hands. In submitting this statement he says:

Here is the positive proof that American mechanics in the aggregate accomplish exactly double the result of the same number of British mechanics. They are therefore very justly paid double in wages.

I think he places the value of the whole product far too high in the United States. He places it at \$8,000,000,000 in 1882, when our best statisticians put it at \$7,000,000,000 now. If he would reduce it to \$6,000,000,000, and it was over \$5,000,000,000 in 1880, it may be reasonable; but to say the product was \$6,000,000,000 in 1882, it would show still that the efficiency of our labor is from 40 per cent. to 50 per cent. greater than that of Great Britain. Our consul at Tunstall, England, makes this report: That in cotton manufactures our productive capacity is 33 per cent. greater than England and 72 per cent. greater than Germany. In woolen manufactures our productive capacity is 23 per cent. greater than England and 40 per cent. greater than Germany. In silk manufacture our productive capacity is 18 per cent. greater than England and 32 per cent. greater than Germany.

Mr. FORD. That is the product per man ?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, that is the product per man. Taking that as the average, how is it possible for these countries, where the rate of wages is low and the labor cost is high, how is it possible for those people to bring their product into our markets and drive ours out?

I will refer to another instance before I close, and that is to a table which is to be found in the first annual report of the Bureau of Labor, pages 132 and 133, which gives the cost of spinning one pound of cotton yarn in England and in Germany. Germany has a protective duty on cotton yarn, while England welcomes the whole world to contest with her.

England with a higher rate of wages exports annually into Germany cotton yarns to the value of ten to eleven millions of dollars, and that over a duty, if I remember rightly, of 10 per cent. The German manufacturers find that they can buy cotton yarns cheaper in England, where the rate of wages is much higher than in Germany. If we look at these tables we will see the reason. Here are two tables giving the labor cost and whole cost of spinning cotton yarns of any number from 1 up to 177. One is the cost in Alsace, Germany, and the other in England, and they show that in every number the labor cost and the whole cost per pound are less in England than in Germany, notwithstanding the higher rate of wages which is paid in England.

Is it the tariff that makes English wages higher than German? Germany has the tariff, but England has the trade. If these statements are true, what is there to prevent us from being the greatest manufacturing and exporting country of the world. We are the greatest agricultural people in the world. We exceed all others in the products of manufacture, but we export next to nothing of our product. Why should we not export the three hundred and seventy-five millions of cotton goods which England is now exporting? She buys her cotton from us, pays the cost of transportation to her factories, makes the goods, and sends them all over the world. That trade, at least the most of it, is ours whenever we get ready to take it.

Why should we not make and send out the hundred millions of woolen goods which she is annually exporting? We have the advantage of her in almost everything except cost of materials. Why should we not make and export the hundred millions of iron and steel which she is making and sending away annually? There is no reason except that high tariffs and trusts and combinations are in our way, and they muster all their forces to prevent us from taking the place which our advantages entitle us to take.

We are the greatest people in the world. We have the highest

standard of civilization; we have the highest and best diffusion of knowledge among our people.

We utilize the power of machinery more than any people in the world. We produce by our labor more than any people in the world. We have everything to command success in any contest over any rival. We are the first cotton-producing country. We have wool, flax, hemp; our country is full of coal, and ores, and lumber, and yet with all these advantages over all others we have pursued a suicidal policy of protection, which has closed the markets of the world against us; and not content to stop here, we have plundered the great body of our agricultural people out of a large part of their wealth. [Applause.]

We must make a departure. Instead of laying on the burdens of taxation upon the necessities of life, instead of destroying our foreign commerce, we should encourage it as we would encourage our home commerce. We should remove every unnecessary burden. We should lay taxes to obtain revenue, but not restrict importation. We should place every material of manufacture on the free-list, start up our fires, put our wheels in motion, and put all our people to work at good wages.

A gentleman said here the other day, on the other side of the House, that our prosperity in this country was due to the tariff. I deny it. Our prosperity in this country is due to the intelligence of our labor, and to the unrestricted movements of our exchanges among sixty millions of people at home. [Applause.]

Mr. Nimmo, the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics a few years ago, in a most elaborate report upon the internal commerce of the country stated that it exceeded our foreign commerce by twenty-five times its amount. Then the internal commerce of this country is equal to \$35,000,000,000 annually. Every dollar of these products increases in value as they go from the point where they are produced to the point where they are consumed. Take a ton of coal mined in West Virginia, for instance, worth \$1 at the mouth of the pit. Start it on its road to Texas, and every hundred miles it travels some hand touches it, some machinery transports it. It has got to pay the cost that increases as it goes, because its value is increased; and when it is delivered finally in the little city where I live in Texas it is worth six to eight dollars a ton, and my neighbors buy and consume it because it is cheaper to them than wood, and cheaper than they can produce the coal themselves.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is with the cotton produced in Texas and sent towards Rhode Island to be spun. Every mile on the road it traverses between the producer and the consumer increases its

value, and it is this interchange of internal commerce of this country, of \$35,000,000,000 annually, that makes us rich and prosperous as a people, and we have grown so, not by the aid of restrictions imposed upon commerce with foreign countries, but absolutely in spite of it. [Applause.]

Our wealth would have been greater as a people if we had none of these restrictions upon our commerce. We will increase wealth if we lower the duties and let importations come in of those things which can be produced cheaper in other countries than in our own.

We will increase the value of all of the agricultural products by such methods. They will diffuse and scatter money amongst the laboring people throughout the country. It will set the wheels of machinery in motion, lay the foundation of happy homes, and a glad smile will light up the faces of the people in all sections of the country at the returning and increased prosperity of the nation. [Applause.]

The policy which is being pursued now may for awhile satisfy the demands of the capitalist who has money invested in the various factories and enterprises of that kind throughout the country. They may be able by the aid of these pools and trusts and combinations which seem to be springing out of the earth all around us to secure for a time the capital invested; but what, I ask you, is to become in the mean time of the poor laborer when they shut off their fires, when they turn him into the streets, and determine that they will limit the product of their establishments in order to keep up prices so as to save the profits on their investments? What is to become of the cotton and the iron and the wool, and all of the other interests that depend upon capital invested in manufacturing enterprises? Where are our markets when our factories are closed, when the wheels are still, when the fires are banked, and their laborers wandering as paupers around the streets seeking employment which is not to be found anywhere in the land? And yet they call this the American policy.

I repel it, sir; it is not American. It is the reverse of American. That policy is American which clings most closely to the fundamental idea that underlies our institutions and upon which the whole superstructure of our Government is erected, and that idea is freedom—freedom secured by the guaranties of government; freedom to think, to speak, to write; freedom to go where we please, select our own occupations; freedom to labor when we please and where we please; freedom to receive and enjoy all the results of our labor; freedom to sell our products, and freedom to buy the products of others, and freedom to markets for the products of our labor, without which

the freedom of labor is restricted and denied. Freedom from restraints in working and marketing the products of our toil, except such as may be necessary in the interest of the Government. Freedom from all unnecessary burdens; freedom from all exactions upon the citizen except such as may be necessary to support an honest, efficient, and economical administration of the Government that guarantees him protection to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" freedom from all taxation except that which is levied for the support of the Government; freedom from taxation levied for the purpose of enriching favored classes by the spoliation and plunder of the people; freedom from all systems of taxation that do not fall with "equal and exact justice upon all"—that do not raise the revenues of government in the way that is least burdensome to the people and with the least possible disturbance to their business. That, sir, is the American policy. [Applause.]

Now another thing. I want to show that the tariff is not for the benefit of the workingman. We will have many appeals made to us for sympathy on account of the workingman. I have taken from the first annual report of the Commissioner of Labor and the report of the census on wages some figures given by manufacturers themselves of the total cost of the product and the labor cost of the articles they are making. I have put the tariff duty by the side of them to show whether in the little reductions we are asking in this bill we have [gone beyond that pledge we as a party have made that we would not reduce taxation so low as to injure our laborers, or as not to cover the difference in cost of labor between American and foreign products.

This will show, and I ask your attention to it, that the tariff is not intended to and does not benefit labor. It will show that the benefit of the tariff never passes beyond the pocket of the manufacturer, and to the pockets of his workmen.

I find in this report one pair of 5-pound blankets. The whole cost as stated by the manufacturer is \$2.51. The labor cost he paid for making them is 35 cents. The present tariff is \$1.90. Now, here is \$1.55 in this tariff over and above the entire labor cost of these blankets. Why did not that manufacturer go and give that money to the laborer? He is able to do it. Here is a tariff that gives him \$1.90 on that pair of blankets for the benefit of his laborer, but notwithstanding that the tariff was imposed for the benefit of American labor and to preserve high wages, every dollar of that tariff went into the manufacturer's pocket. The poor fellow who made the blankets got 35 cents and the manufacturer kept the \$1.90.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman please state how much the committee has reduced that duty?

Mr. MILLS. To \$1.00 from \$1.90.

Take another pair of 5-pound blankets. The total cost is \$2.70. The labor cost is 70 cents. The tariff is \$1.98. Now, how strange it is that none of these sums that were intended for the laborer ever get beyond the pocket of the manufacturer. Why is it, when the American Congress enacted this legislation for the benefit of our labor, that every dollar of this aid intended for labor stops in the pockets of the manufacturer, who goes into the highways and hedges and hires his laborer at the lowest price for which he can get him in the market and then pockets the tariff benefits that we are told every day is intended for the laborer alone—for the benefit of labor?

Here is another pair of 5-pound blankets. The cost is \$3.39. The labor cost paid by this manufacturer, he says himself, is 61 cents. The tariff is \$2.55. In the pending bill we have left him \$1.35, and we have left the other man \$1.08. And we have left all along not only enough to cover the difference, if there was any difference, between the labor cost of production in Europe and the labor cost of production in this country, but we have left enough to pay for all the labor and a bonus besides.

Let us go on a little further. Here is 1 yard of flannel, weighing 4 ounces; it cost 18 cents, of which the laborer got 3 cents; the tariff on it is 8 cents. How is it that the whole 8 cents did not get into the pockets of the laborer? Is it not strange that those who made the tariff and fastened upon the people these war rates in a time of profound peace, and who are now constantly assailing the Democratic party because it is untrue to the workingman, did not make some provision by which the generous bounty they gave should reach the pocket of him for whom they said it was intended? They charge that we are trying to strike down the labor of the country. Why do they not see that the money they are taking out of the hard earnings of the people is delivered in good faith to the workman?

One yard of cassimere weighing 16 ounces costs \$1.38; the labor cost is 29 cents; the tariff duty is 80 cents. One pound of sewing silk costs \$5.66; the cost for labor is 85 cents; the tariff is \$1.69. One gallon of linseed oil costs 46 cents; the labor cost is 2 cents; the tariff cost is 25 cents. One ton of bar-iron costs \$31; the labor cost is \$10; the tariff fixes several rates for bar-iron. I give the lowest rate, \$17.92. One ton of foundry pig-iron costs \$11; the labor costs \$1.64; the tariff is \$6.72.

None of these tariff rates go to the laborer. The road is blocked

up. They cannot pass the pocket of the manufacturer. This "great American system" that is intended to secure high wages for our laborers is so perverted that all its beneficence intended for the poor workman stops in the pocket of his employer, and the laborer only gets what he can command in the open market for his work.

Let us take Bessemer-steel rails. We are told that the steel-rail industry is in great danger of utterly perishing away and departing from this continent, because we propose to reduce the duty from \$17 to \$11.

The whole cost is put down at \$31, the labor cost at \$7.57; the tariff is \$17. The manufacturer has \$9.43 more for each ton than all the labor cost. The labor cost of this ton is exceptionally high. I have a statement of the labor cost of a ton of steel rails at Bethlehem, Pa., taken recently by Mr. Schoenhof, and it shows labor cost there \$3.85 per ton. The labor cost of a ton of steel rails in England is not one dollar cheaper than here. Mr. Schoenhof informs me that a ton of bar-iron costs, for labor, in England about \$7.75, and here about \$8. But let us leave these and proceed with the official figures. A keg of steel nails costs \$2.34; the labor cost is 67 cents, the tariff is \$1.25. A ton of pipe-iron costs \$34.57; labor cost, \$12.26; the tariff is \$22.40.

Here is a car-wheel weighing 500 pounds; cost \$13; labor cost, 85 cents; tariff rate is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, equivalent to \$12.50, to cover a labor cost of 85 cents! [Laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, these laborers of ours ought to get immensely rich if they could get all that Congress votes to them, if the manufacturers did not stop the bounties intended by the Government to reach the pockets of the workingmen.

Here is a coarse wool suit of clothes such as our working people wear in their daily toil in the shop and field. The whole cost is \$12. The labor cost is \$2. The tariff duty is 40 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. As the weight of the suit is not given, we cannot get the exact tariff, but the duty on woolen clothes imported last year averaged 54 per cent., and at that rate the tariff stands \$6.48 to cover \$2 of labor cost.

A cotton suit costs \$10.50; the labor cost is \$1.65; the tariff is \$3.67. A dozen goblets cost 48 cents; labor cost, 15 cents; tariff, 19 cents. White lead, by the hundredweight, \$9.50; labor cost, 50 cents; tariff, \$3. A hundredweight of mixed paints, \$8; labor cost, 41 cents; tariff, \$2.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have gone through with a number of articles taken from these official reports made by the manufacturers themselves, and I have shown that the tariff was not framed for the

benefit of the laborer, or that if it was so intended by those who framed it, the benefit never reaches the laborer, not a dollar of it. The working people are hired in the market at the lowest rates at which their services can be had, and all the "boodle" that has been granted by these tariff bills goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. It builds up palaces; it concentrates wealth; it makes great and powerful magnates; but it distributes none of its beneficence in the homes of our laboring poor.

It brings the tax-gatherer to them; it weighs them down as it goes; it compels them to pay out a large share of their daily earnings for the necessities of life; and the money it raises by high prices on domestic manufactures it transfers not into the coffers of the Government, but into the coffers of private individuals. It is making a wide distinction in this country between two classes—one numerous, but poor; one small, but powerful and rich. It is a policy that is at war with the institutions of this country. The concentration of the wealth of the country in the hands of a few will in progress of time overthrow the very foundations of our free government.

Now, gentlemen, the time has come, after all these taxes on wealth have been swept away, after the people of this country have been bearing for years these enormous burdens that have been levied on the necessities of life; now, when "trusts," and "combinations," and "pools" are arising all around us to limit production, to increase prices, to make the laborer's lot harder and darker—now the time has come for us to do something, not for classes, but for the great masses of our people.

I hope and trust that the bill which we have presented to you and which has met with favor throughout the whole country will receive a majority of your votes, a majority of the votes of the Senate, and become a law. I earnestly hope when the Treasury is full to overflowing of the people's hard earnings, you will lighten their burden, and reduce the taxes on the necessities of life.

Although the bill we propose is not all that we could have asked, although it is a very moderate bill, yet it will send comfort and happiness into the homes and bosoms of the poor laboring people of this country, and I ask you now in behalf of them to consider their claims and help to reduce the burdens that have so long been laid upon their shoulders.

[Enthusiastic applause on the Democratic side, and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to forward herewith such statistics as I have been able to prepare, showing the cost of production of textiles at two different periods in several mills of the United States.

Very respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT, *Commissioner*.

Hon. ROGER Q. MILLS, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

Values of the products of domestic manufactures, of domestic manufactures exported, of foreign manufactures imported, and of the total consumption of domestic and foreign manufactures in 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880, with the proportions of domestic and foreign manufactures consumed in 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880.

Year.	Values of—				Consumption of—	
	Products of domestic manufactures.*	Exports of domestic manufactures.†	Imports ‡ of manufactures.†	Consumption of domestic and foreign manufactures.	Domestic manufactures.	Imported manufactures.
1850.....	\$1,019,106,616	\$22,903,888	\$130,838,280	\$1,127,041,008	<i>Per cent.</i> 83.39	<i>Per cent.</i> 11.61
1860.....	1,885,861,676	45,658,873	261,264,310	2,101,467,113	87.57	12.42
1870.....	4,232,325,442	47,921,154	308,363,496	4,492,767,784	93.14	6.86
1880.....	5,369,579,191	79,510,447	423,699,010	5,713,767,754	92.58	7.42

* Census years.

† Years ending June 30.

‡ Gross imports.

WM. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau*.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
February 18, 1888.

Values of the products of domestic manufactures and of the exports of domestic manufactures, with the proportions of such manufactures retained for home consumption and exported, in 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880.

Years.	Values of—		Proportion of Domestic Manufactures—	
	Products of domestic manufacture.*	Exports of domestic manufacture.†	Retained for home consumption.	Exported.
1850.....	\$1,019,106,616	\$22,903,888	<i>Per cent.</i> 97.75	<i>Per cent.</i> 2.25
1860.....	1,885,861,676	45,658,873	97.58	2.42
1870.....	4,232,325,442	47,921,154	98.87	1.13
1880.....	5,369,579,191	79,510,447	98.52	1.48

* Census years.

† Years ending June 30.

WM. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau*.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
February 18, 1888.

Cost of production, etc., in the United States at two periods.

THE FIRST PERIOD—1849 TO 1860.

Number of establishment.	Year	State.	Industry.		Product per em- ployé per day on full time.		Labor cost per unit of meas- ure.	Average daily earnings of employés on full time.	Number of employés reduced to full time.			Weavers.		
			General.	Special.	Quan- tity.	Unit of measure.			Day hands.	Piece hands.	Total.	Num- ber.	Wages. per day for each.	Yards per day for each.
1	1849	Massachusetts...	Cotton...	Print cloth..	44.5	Yards...	\$0.01499	\$0.667	58	57	115	45	\$0.05	113.3
2	1850	Massachusetts...	Cotton...	Print cloth..	42.0	Yards...	0.01547	0.650	70	154	230
3	1852	Massachusetts...	Cotton...	Sheetings...	41.3	Yards...	0.01634	0.670	169	317	486	180	0.70	130.6
4	1855	New Hampshire..	Cotton...	Print cloth..	42.5	Yards...	0.01576	0.670	414	350	764	283	0.05	114.5
5	1858	Massachusetts...	Woolen...	Cassimeres..	1.5	Yards...	0.70000	1.050	50	45	95	30	0.90	4.8
6	1858	Massachusetts...	Woolen...	Flannel.....	10.0	Pounds..	0.10000	1.000	26	32	58	20	0.90	a 30.0
7	1860	New York.....	Iron.....	Pig "anth."	‡	Ton.....	2.02500	1.080	75

THE SECOND PERIOD—1884 TO 1887.

1	1884	Massachusetts...	Cotton...	Print cloth..	98.2	Yards...	\$0.01018	\$1.00	151	244	395	142	\$1.06	273.4
2	1884	Massachusetts...	Cotton...	Print cloth..	102.0	Yards...	0.01029	1.05	150	260	410
3	1886	Massachusetts...	Cotton...	Sheetings...	73.0	Yards...	0.01309	1.00	227	530	757	280	1.17	194.0
4	1886	New Hampshire..	Cotton...	Print cloth..	103.0	Yards...	0.01019	1.05	394	760	1154	429	1.05	278.0
5	1886	Massachusetts...	Woolen...	Cassimeres..	3.2	Yards...	0.40875	1.50	60	80	140	40	1.45	11.2
6	1887	Massachusetts...	Woolen...	Flannel.....	10.9	Pounds..	0.07100	1.20	23	40	63	19	1.02	*55.0
7	1886	New York.....	Iron	Pig "anth."	‡	Ton.....	1.80028	1.49	95

* Pounds per day for each.

The two periods considered with respect to labor cost.

No. of establish- ment.	Periods.	State.	Increase in product.	Increase in wages.	If wages of first period prevailed in second and were applicable to product of second, the following would be—		Decrease of labor- cost per unit of measure.
					Labor cost per unit of measure.	Per cent. of such labor cost of labor cost of first period.	
1	1849-1884.	Massachusetts.....	Per cent. 120.6	Per cent. 50.0	\$0.000792	45.3	Per cent. 32.0
2	1850-1884	Massachusetts.....	142.8	61.5	0.000372	41.2	33.4
3	1852-1886	Massachusetts.....	77.0	49.2	0.000178	56.5	15.7
4	1855-1886	New Hampshire.....	142.3	56.7	0.000504	41.2	35.3
5	1856-1886	Massachusetts.....	113.3	42.9	0.328125	46.8	33.3
6	1858-1887	Massachusetts.....	69.0	20.0	0.050110	59.1	29.0
7	1860-1886	New York.....	54.4	38.0	1.311428	64.8	10.6

HON. THOMAS B. REED,

OF MAINE.

(Republican Side.)

I purpose to discuss to-day some of the general principles which, in my opinion, underlie the two modes of national action which are confessedly in dispute in Congress and in the country. I shall treat the bill before us as in their hearts the leaders on the other side treat it, as a step only in a particular direction. The whole course of the debate has gone that way, and it is a just and proper way.

How important the propositions at issue are the intense interest already excited by the pending measures on two continents bears the strongest witness that can be borne by men. Those who, living on this side of the ocean, grow and make articles which are necessary for the comfort and happiness of the people of the United States are on one side of the question, while the foreign manufacturers, foreign political economists, and foreign statesmen are all on the other.

This, however, should not prejudice the question. If it be true that by having their goods manufactured abroad the people of the United States as a whole would become richer and more prosperous, would have their houses better furnished, their tables spread with finer linen, and covered with more healthful food; if their bodies would be protected by warmer woollens from the cold of Maine and by finer clothing from the burning sun of Texas; if they would on the whole, and from generation to generation, enjoy more of the comforts and luxuries of life, and would themselves be more intelligent, more independent, and better fitted to be the citizens of a Republic already great and destined to be mighty beyond all former dreams of empire, then by all means let us sink national prejudice, burst the barriers of provincial narrowness, and with one accord adopt not merely the present bill, but such legislation

as will surely treble the spindles of Europe and destroy our own—such measures as will put out our furnaces and illumine those beyond the sea.

Let us vote for such laws as will make our mines mere holes in the ground, and stand aside to behold the glory alike of free raw materials and cheap goods purchased in the cheapest markets. Let the tall chimneys no longer disfigure our beautiful skies, and the rushing streams flow to the sea unvexed by mill-wheels, their murmurs undisturbed by the clash of the shuttles and the click of the looms.

If of every two dollars in our pockets, the one alone is sufficient, if spent in England, to give us all we have now, and we are sure of still having in our pockets the same two dollars which we now have, surely the problem is too easy for dispute, too simple for discussion. We have only to pass a bill which gives free course to what the free-trade professors, with glib secularization of the Deity, call the international law of the Almighty; and if the learned economists on the other side are true to their logic, and do not palter with both their language and their convictions, they can propose no other course.

Napoleon was right when he said that Europe must be Cossack or republican; Lincoln was right when he said the United States must be either free or slave. The house divided against itself has to unite or fall. The revenue-reform argument is either a false pretense or covers the whole ground. Protection is either in its essence a benefit or a curse. You cannot dilute a curse and make it a blessing. Ratsbane and water are no more food than ratsbane pure. [Laughter.] Incidental protection is a sham. Tariff for revenue only goes down before the same arguments which are used against protection.

If protection be a tax for manufacturers' benefit, then it is the same tax if it be the result of even a revenue tariff. Incidental protection is of all the most inexcusable. It is an accident which ought to be avoided like a railway disaster. If when you take one dollar from the citizen for the Treasury and four for the manufacturer, is it any the less robbery that you call it a revenue tariff?

If you gentlemen on the other side believe what you say, you ought to be as furious against the rapine and plunder of the Mills bill as you profess to be against those of the present law.

The President is the leader of the Democracy. He is also the dispenser of patronage, and as he is rapidly shaking the dust of civil-service reform off his feet [laughter], he is assuming control over his party. One paragraph in his message covers the whole

ground of protection and free trade, and points out the plain duty of the Democracy.

There is but one free trade, and the President is its prophet. Whoever falls in battle in the service of this new Allah and its prophet, for him shall open the shining gates of the heaven of foreign missions and Federal offices. [Laughter.] Therefore, with confidence I quote to the true believers the inspired wisdom of the message. It is an old quotation much wondered at. The mere wisdom of this world has refuted it many times and oft. But it is of the essence of the doctrines which oppose protection. It is the warp and woof of the whole discussion, which must be my excuse for again inflicting it on a weary world. "These laws," he says, and he is speaking of tariff laws—"These laws raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by *precisely* the sum paid for such duties." "Precisely" is the word he uses, and it is a word of tremendous significance. But the corollary which he draws from the whole sentence is of still more tremendous significance. If the consumer pays "precisely" the duty in excess of the price of the imported article, then the President is also right when he says that on all domestic protected articles the consumer pays "nearly or quite the same enhanced price." That is the whole counsel of the Lord on the subject. Whether the protection be incidental or accidental, the result of war tariff or peace tariff, the consumer not only pays the duty on imported articles to the Government, but also on all domestic productions its equivalent to the greedy manufacturer.

At last, then, we have a mathematical basis on which to calculate the damage inflicted on this country by the system established by the men who framed the Constitution. By tariff taxes, whether great or small, whereby manufactures are encouraged, every dollar raised by the Government takes out of the pockets of the people other dollars and puts them into the pockets of capitalists. All these dollars are not merely changed from the pockets of the poor to the pockets of the rich—their value is lost to the nation; for by just so much has the nation's labor been unprofitably expended and wasted.

Since, then, we pay to protected industries the equivalent of the duty which is imposed on imported articles, we have only to calculate the amount of this payment thus lost to the country to find just what we have been doing and just where we are. Our manufactured products in 1880 were \$5,370,000,000. If you add less than one-third for increase you will have for the year 1887 the figures given by the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, \$7,000,000,000. If you take only one-half of this sum as being under protection, and calcu-

late the duty, you will find that the sum uselessly paid is more than one thousand millions of dollars.

Since 1880 more than six thousand six hundred millions of dollars have been wrested from the people, and six thousand six hundred millions would have bought every acre of farming land in the United States at the outbreak of the war. If you carry back the baleful calculation to the day when we Republicans took charge of the country, you will find, if the President be right, that we have thrown away the whole value of the land we lived in, and instead of turning over to civil-service reform a country worth \$44,000,000,000, we turned over a rack-rented farm mortgaged far beyond its value.

There are other remarkable figures to be deduced from that paragraph in the message; figures which must light up the pathway of Democratic duty with the electric light of conscience. [Laughter.] In 1887 forty millions of woolen goods were imported, paying twenty-seven millions of duties, 40 per cent. on cost and duties. This went to the Government. Three hundred and fifty-six millions of domestic woolen manufactures were bought that same year by the impoverished American people. Under the radiant light of the message it will be seen that one hundred and forty-two millions of that money went into the gaping pockets of manufacturers and were lost forever to the down-trodden people. [Laughter and applause.]

We imported thirty-one millions' worth of silk; we manufactured forty-six millions, of which sixteen and one-half millions lined the purses of the plunderers. The same story can be told of every protected industry, until the total of more than one thousand millions of the people's money rolls into the pockets of these licensed robbers of the poor. If this message from our ruler be true, every factory is the abode of a robber baron, more fell and sure than ever swooped down a European hill-side to harry a cavalcade of honest merchants.

In every mine mouth lurks a more dreadful giant than ever before smelled the blood of an Englishman. [Renewed laughter.] But what do the friends of virtue propose to do with these wicked people? Sweep them out of existence with the strong hand of justice? Does the gentleman from Texas intend to lasso these creatures and tangle them in the folds of his lariat? Does the gentleman from Arkansas mean that from their dead bodies the handle of his bowie-knife shall protrude? Ah, no! they are still to live and still to flourish. They will have only the delightful punishment of being turned over to the melting eloquence, the soothing rhetoric, of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Breckinridge] while he explains his theory of fair plunder, of honest and decent robbery, with no restric-

tions save such as will be satisfactory to those good manufacturers who have been admitted to private interviews by the back-stairs. [Laughter and applause.]

The castles of these marauders are still to smoke upon the hill-tops, and the tall chimneys are still to break the sky-line of this unhappy country. They are to be allowed to rob within 7 per cent. of what they rob now, and as compensation they are to be let loose upon the markets of the world, where, according to the learned chairman, they are to reap larger wealth and pile up statelier millions. Do you think that the calculations I have made are but ridiculous imaginings of a scoffer; are but toying with the deep seriousness of the Presidential mind? Nay, not so. The belief that what I have figured out is absolute truth pervades the Democratic mind from one extremity to the other; from the very head to the very tail. [Renewed laughter and applause.]

The Hon. John Randolph Tucker, then a member from Virginia, as delightful in private life as he was able in the service of his country, in the year of our Lord 1882, in a speech delivered May 5, on the twenty-fifth page of the same, made the annual sum thus plundered from the people eight hundred millions for the year 1880. That speech was the most frank and honest grappling with the question I have seen, except perhaps the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill]. In the same year, on the 20th day of April, in a speech delivered that day, on page 6 thereof, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the member from Illinois, proclaimed the astounding fact that during the last nineteen years these ungodly manufacturers had swindled the people out of \$15,000,000,000. Let me be exact, for the calculation is specific and precise. The exact sum was \$15,063,745,645. [Laughter.] I do not need to cite the learned occupant of the chair [Mr. Springer], or the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox], or even that individual who from the Speaker's bench in the gallery overlooked the opening of the debate on the bill which it is insinuated he did not frame. He made it a thousand millions a year six years ago.

Great heavens! These amazing plunderers had in their pockets fifteen thousand millions in 1882; have had eight hundred millions a year since—in all, nineteen thousand eight hundred millions, or three thousand millions more than this whole country is listed for taxation, and the Mills bill, the representative of the concentrated and concatenated wisdom of the Democracy, proposes to give them more. [Applause and laughter.] Gentlemen of the other side, heroes of the new crusade for revenue reform and civil-service

reform, if you believe what you say, is it not ample time that this tribute cease? What excuse have you for continuing it?

If the President be right, and you don't dare to doubt him, an annual tribute is paid protected manufacturers out of the pockets of the people more impoverishing than ever was exacted by an Oriental despot. In the face of your plain duty to free the people from this iron yoke you stand higgling about the amount of the tribute. Instead of \$47 for every hundred you purpose to give \$40 of the people's money and throw into the trade the markets of the world!

If it be a tribute, be bold and sweep it away. Why do you hesitate? Is it because you dare not be caught lowering the wages of the laboring men who have votes? Have the courage of your leaders' convictions—for has not the gentleman from Texas, godfather of this bill, who has promised to bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, loudly proclaimed to the open day that tariffs have nothing to do with wages? Is it out of mercy to the capitalist that you falter? [Laughter.]

Do you say there is capital invested under our laws, and we must keep faith with those who have invested it? Whether faith should be kept with such vampires is for you to say. But surely no better faith need be kept than to pay back every cent they have invested. If the President be right, if John Randolph Tucker be right, if the honorable and gallant member be right; if J. S. Moore, who fixes the tribute in 1882 at one thousand millions, more than any of us, be right—if they all be right, then every year more than one thousand millions come out of the people for these men.

What is their whole stock in trade? What is the tale of every dollar they have as capital invested? If you take one-half the industries as protected, and we have made our other calculations on that basis, the whole capital is only one billion eight hundred and sixty million dollars. Now we have shown, according to our chief ruler, that the plunder of these manufacturers is \$1,000,000,000. Therefore, in one year and four-fifths of a year, every dollar of that capital could be repaid, provided they kept their mill-wheels unturned, and the people of the United States, protected against protection, could be as free and as happy as if the ægis of the Confederate constitution, article 1, section 8, were spread all over the land. [Jeers on the Democratic side.]

Why do men with such beliefs so plain, and so distinct, hesitate to do their duty? It is because every wind that blows, every sight that strikes their eyes, every sound that resounds in their ears, shows the folly of their theories, the absurdity of their logic. What use is it to tell the people of this empire that they have been robbed and

plundered one thousand millions of dollars every year, during the very time when over 3,500 miles of distance cities have been springing up like magic, richer in a decade than the old-world cities have grown in centuries; when 120,000 miles of railroad have been built, which compress the broad expanse of a continent into a week of time; when the commerce of its inland lakes has grown to rival the commerce between the two worlds; when from every land under the sun the emigrants have been flocking to its happy shores, drawn there by the peace and prosperity which shine on all its borders and sweep from circumference to center. There are no eyes so dull that cannot see the ever-rising glories of this Republic except those which are bandaged by the prejudices of long ago. [Applause on Republican side.]

Thus far I have employed a familiar method of argumentation which is called in Latin *reductio ad absurdum*, or, in plain English, confronting the principles a man lays down with the facts of the universe and showing him the dreadful absurdity of which he has been guilty. [Laughter.] The principles are the President's, the facts are from his own familiar friends. Which do you believe? The two sentences of the message which I have quoted are the essence of free trade. Whoever believes them has but one honest course to pursue. He must demand direct taxation. There is no escape from it. [Applause.]

Now let us turn to the other side. The system we believe in is called protection, and is founded upon the doctrine that a great nation like ours, having all varieties of climate and soil, will be richer, more independent, and more thrifty, and that its people will be better fitted to enjoy the comforts and luxuries of peace, and better situated to endure the calamities of war, if its own people supply its own wants.

I do not purpose to defend protection. Its vast growth within the last quarter of a century defends it better even than eloquent orations. It was born with the Republic. It is the faith and practice of every civilized nation under the sun save one. It has survived the assaults of all the professors of the "dismal science" called political economy. It has stood up against all the half knowledge of learned men who never had sense enough to transmute their learning into wisdom. [Great applause.]

On the face of the earth to-day there are but two sets of people who believe in free trade, whether pure and simple or disguised as revenue reform, and those two are the masked majority of the Committee on Ways and Means and their followers and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with Ireland suppressed.

Russia, the granary of Europe, has abandoned free trade, with the striking result that whereas, in 1876, before the duties were raised, she bought eight million hundredweight of British metals and paid therefor thirty million of dollars (eight for thirty), she got the same quantity in 1884 and paid only seventeen million for it (eight for seventeen). Three dollars and seventy-five cents per hundredweight before tariff, and \$2.12½ after. Austria, Germany, Italy, Mexico, and the Dominion of Canada, that child of Britain herself, have all joined the army of protection. It is the instinct of humanity against the assumptions of the book men. It is the wisdom of the race against the wisdom of the few.

Perhaps the best argument I can make for protection is to state what it is and the principles on which it is founded.

Man derives his greatest power from his association with other men, his union with his fellows. Whoever considers the human being as a creature alone, by himself, isolated and separated, and tries to comprehend mankind by mathematically adding these atoms together, has utterly failed to comprehend the human race and its tremendous mission.

Sixty millions even of such creatures without association are only so many beasts that perish. But sixty millions of men welded together by national brotherhood, each supporting, sustaining, and buttressing the other, are the sure conquerors of all those mighty powers of nature which alone constitute the wealth of this world. [Applause.] The great blunder of the Herr Professor of political economy is that he treats human beings as if every man were so many foot-pounds, such and such a fraction of a horse-power. All the soul of man he leaves out.

Think for a moment of the foundation principles involved in this question, which I now ask, Where does wealth come from? It comes from the power of man to let loose and yet guide those elemental forces the energy of which is infinite. It comes from the power of man to force the earth to give her increase to hold in the bellying sail the passing breeze, to harness the tumbling waterfall, to dam up the great rivers, to put bits in the teeth of the lightning. Foot-pounds and fractions of a horse-power will never do this. It takes brains and the union of foot-pounds and fractions of a horse-power working harmoniously together.

To grasp the full powers of nature, to reap the richest wealth of the world, we must utilize the full power of man, not merely muscles and brains, but those intangible qualities which we call energy, vigor, ambition, confidence, and courage. Have you never remarked the wonderful difference between a sleepy country village,

lying lazily alongside an unused waterfall, where more than half the energy of the people was lost for lack of the kind of work they wanted to do; where, whenever three men met together in the road, the rest looked out of the windows, idly wondering what the riot was about [laughter], and that same village after the banks were lined with workshops and the air was noisy with the whirr of the spindles, and every man was so eager to work that there never seemed hours enough in the day to tear from the powers of nature their imprisoned richness?

If you have, you have also seen the contrast between men left to themselves, so many foot-pounds and fractions of a horse-power, and men incited by hope, spurred on by ambition, and lighted on their way by the confidence of success. [Applause.]

For a nation to get out of itself or out of the earth all the wealth there is in both, it is not necessary for the nation to buy cheap or sell dear. That concerns individuals alone. What concerns the nation is how to utilize all the work there is in men, both of muscle and brain, of body and of soul, in the great enterprise of setting in motion the ever-gratuitous forces of nature.

How shall you get out of the people of a nation their full powers? Right here is precisely the dividing line. The let alone school say, leave individual man to his own devices. The protectionist school say, let us stimulate combined and aggregated man to united endeavor. What made men work before governments? Was it an intellectual belief that work was good for the muscles? Not the least in the world. It was hunger and desire. Hunger has ceased to play the greater part, but desire will never pass away.

In the ever-growing desire of mankind for new worlds of comfort and luxury to conquer is the blazing promise of the unhasting, unrelenting march of civilization. In that column of march the whole nation must be ranged. Association is the instinct of humanity which grows with its growth. First the family, then the tribe, and then the nation. The race will come by and by. Faithfulness to each in their order is the true route to the next.

Here in the United States are 60,000,000 people with all the varied characters their numbers indicate. Some have faculties fit for farming, some for the management of machinery, some for invention. The problem before you is what system will get from all these creatures, so different from each other, the maximum of work and wealth and wisdom. [Applause.]

I have already said that the great incentive, the motive power of man, is desire. That is the magnet which draws him, but, like all other magnets, it must be put near the armature. The quench

ing of desire must not cost too much. The pathway to its accomplishment must not be too rugged. If you say to him who loves invention and hates farming, your path and your desire lies through the cultivation of the fields, he will say this thing costs too much. If you say to the man who loves the fields, your way must be through the workshop, you bar his progress.

There is only one way to get the best work out of men, and that is to give each the work he can do best. You can only accomplish this by diversifying industry. To diversify industry completely in a country such as ours, there is but one way given under heaven among men. To enable the American people themselves to supply all their wants, you must give and assure to the American people the American markets. What does this phrase mean in practical life? It means that we, the nation, say to capital, "Embark yourself in the manufacture of such and such articles, and you shall have a market to the extent of the wants of the American people."

Capital then says to labor, "Go with me into this new field, all of you who like this work best, and we will share the results." Then begins a new industry. Multiply this by hundreds and you have a community where every man honestly minded will get what on the whole suits him best, and the nation will get the greatest amount of work from the greatest number.

To this system, so far sketched, no human being can find reasonable objections. But it is averred that there are some drawbacks. It is alleged that the people who are in the older industries—those which establish themselves without law—have to pay higher prices for the articles so manufactured, and that the employment in new industries is all at their expense. This does not in the least touch upon the utilization of human energy and natural energy which would otherwise run to waste. It does not touch upon the question of the divine right of those who are adapted to the older industries to reap alone the riches of the earth.

So seemingly unjust has this last appeared in one instance, that of the land-owner, that a prominent free-trader, Mr. Henry George, who will vote next election for revenue reform, has proposed to take away from land more or less of its value to the owner. That I do not agree to. I make no reclamations on that account.

I meet the question squarely and asseverate that protection does not raise prices. The opposite statement and the argument which backs it up I purpose to state fairly, for we now come to the famous revenue-reform dilemma. You tell us, they say, that protection is for the purpose of enhancing prices to enable high wages to be paid, and yet you say that protection lowers prices. This is flat contra-

diction. So it is as you state it. But your statement, like all revenue-reform statements, flourishes only by assumption.

In order to make yourself clear, you have utterly omitted the element of time. You assume that we say that both our statements of higher prices for higher wages and lower prices for consumers are for the same instant of time. Not so. When you begin there are higher prices for higher wages, but when you establish your manufactories, at once the universal law of competition begins to work. The manufactories abroad, urged upon by the lower prices which the tariff forces them to offer in order to compete with us, cause every element of economy in manufacture to be set in motion. Every intellect is put to work to devise new machinery which will produce at lower cost, to seek out new methods of utilizing waste, to consolidation of effort to lessen general expenses, and the thousand and one devices every year invented to get more work out of the powers of nature.

At home the same causes are at work, and with redoubled energy, because on account of higher wages there are greater inducements to substitute labor-saving devices for costly labor. And this colossal struggle between two great empires of industry, the foreign and the domestic, results everywhere in the cheapness of commodities, in which progress of cheapness the world has marched on in one unbroken undeviating line, until to-day the citizens of the United States, the sovereigns of to-day, as we call them in moments of patriotic exaltation, the poorest citizens have for the commonest necessities of life the luxuries of the sovereigns of old days. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That lower prices will come at once we have never said. That they will come and grow lower and lower so that in the series of years which make up a man's life all he needs will cost him less than under revenue reform we asseverate and maintain, and all history is behind our asseverations.

But would not all this take place under free trade; would not English manufactures, supplying all the world, have grown thus cheaper by themselves? Let me answer this question by two others. Do you believe in the lowering of prices by competition? Of course you do. Do you believe that the great production of \$7,000,000,000 of manufactures have not entered into competition with those of England? You know that they have been the great power which has forced English prices down.

Do you want an example of to-day? In 1883 the importers were eager to prevent the increase of the tariff on pottery. I know it, because a gentleman was here earnestly urging me not to consent to

the increase. Only three years afterwards he acknowledged to me that the foreign manufacturers were obliged, in the face of the great increase of product, both in quantity and quality, to cut their prices so as to pay even more than the tariff tax. Perhaps some revenue reformer may ask me, on the strength of this example, how our raising tariff helped manufacturers here if the foreign manufacturer lowered his prices.

I am glad to answer that question, for it answers many others. Before the raise we were on pottery fighting foreigners gorged with profits and flushed with the spoils of our markets. To-day we are fighting them on even terms, or would have been but for the package clause. Their profits would be going into our treasury, not into their pockets, and between them and us would still be going on that equal contest for cheaper and cheaper manufactures which, without lowering wages, is giving us every day lower prices and an ever-widening manufacture.

Perhaps some gentleman will say to me that this is all a dream; that the very fact of a barrier raised by our tariff prevents competition. Every manufacturer knows better. England must work or starve. She has piled up her capital, and if she cannot get large profits she will take small. Let me not confine myself to theory. Let me once more recall that tremendous fact about Russia. In 1876, three years before her tariff, she bought 8,000,000 hundredweight of British metals at \$30,000,000, 8 for 30. In 1883, four years after the tariff, she bought the same amount, 8,000,000 hundredweight for \$17,000,000, 8 for 17—\$3.75 per hundredweight before, \$2.12 after. Was that the effect of the Russian tariff alone? Not so. It was the effect of tariffs the world over.

Let me show the same fundamental fact on a larger scale. I have here the report of the royal commission to inquire into the causes of the depression of British trade. There is much matter of excellent admission throughout that work, but one paragraph will serve my present purpose. It is on the page numbered xii, where you will find that the exports in 1883 were £240,000,000, but that the value of those same exports at the prices of ten years before were £349,000,000.

The difference is £109,000,000—\$545,000,000. If you want it in percentage, you will find that you must add more than 45 per cent. to the price of 1883 to get the richly profitable prices of 1873. To what does the world owe this gain of \$545,000,000 in a single year? Who was the fruitful mother of all this gain?

She whom in your short-sighted wisdom you have always called barren, tariff taxes [applause]; and facing your most opprobrious

phrase, the one you roll most lovingly under your tongue, I dare to asseverate that if the whole world will repeal its tariff taxes England will reap in the next ten years not only ten times these five hundred and forty-five millions, but a thousand millions more every year. Tariff taxes! How men like to fool themselves with phrases! Because the taxing power is used not only for revenue but as the barrier, and taxes are odious, therefore the barrier must be odious also. How can taxes produce? This is only mere trifling. Can you keep cattle out of the cornfield by sticking wood into the ground? Yes, if you make a fence.

Do you mean to tell me, said the wise bumpkin to the engineer on the banks of the Merrimac—do you mean to tell me that you can make that stream useful by putting rocks into it? Yes, said the engineer, as he proceeded to build his dam and set in motion the water-wheels of mighty Lowell.

I have said that the professor of political economy treats man as a soulless aggregation of foot-pounds. Let me give you a striking example of this humanizing science.

The British commission report, from which I have quoted, says, page xxi, paragraph 82, speaking of shorter hours of labor :

It must be for the country and the workman himself to decide whether the advantages of shorter hours compensate for the increased cost of production or diminished output. We believe that they do, and on social as well as on economical grounds we should regret to see any curtailment of the leisure and freedom which the workman now enjoys. No advantage which could be expected to accrue to the commerce of the country would, in our opinion, compensate for such a change.

On the commission was Bonamy Price, the only recognized professor on it, and here is his sole contribution to this volume :

I beg to express my dissent from paragraph 82. It contains a specified repudiation of the great doctrine of free trade. [Great is Diana of the Ephesians.] Shorter hours of labor do not and can not compensate to a nation for increased cost of production or diminished output. They tax the community with dearer goods in order to confer special advantages on the working man. They protect him, and that is a direct repudiation of free trade. The country is sentenced to dearer and fewer goods.

BONAMY PRICE.

He is right, the dear professor, though rather crisp and brutal. Shorter hours and higher wages are "direct repudiations of free trade." [Laughter and applause.]

Let me now treat you to an argument for protection in America

out of Bastiat. Frederic Bastiat, of France, was the brightest free-trader that ever charged down the lines. No man can refuse the tribute of admiration to the wonderful play of that subtle intellect. He has furnished the other side most of its brains and all its dialectics.

Yet while he is arguing free trade for France, I think he has proved protection for America. Talking to Frenchmen, he says: "I say, and I think so very sincerely, that if two countries find themselves placed in unequal conditions of production, *it is that one which is the least favored of nature which has the most to gain by liberty of exchanges.*"

He proves his case this way. Labor is the sole cost. All the rest is' the gratuity of nature. Whatever labor produces in one land more than the same labor in another land is difference of gratuity only. It is the measure of relative richness of the two countries. If one man should discover rich soil he would alone reap the gratuity. If ten thousand men discover it the principle of competition comes in and the gratuity goes to consumers. If one farm could double its fertility, the owner would be richer. If all the farms doubled their fertility, the whole gratuity would go over to the consumers. Let me illustrate that by something which Bastiat never knew, for he died forty years ago.

If one railroad alone in this country had had steel rails, all the benefit of that would have gone to the company. But when all the companies had them, and thereby could do their work cheaper and so save vast amounts of money, some railroad presidents looked for big dividends. What happened? Why, each one said, I can get a little more business if I do it cheaper, and get the same results. Then they began to compete, and the final result now is that that magnificent gift of nature through Sir Henry Bessemer, the difference between strong, long-lived steel rail, and the weak, short-lived iron rail, has, every dollar of it, gone to the people, making cheap transportation instead of big dividends. [Applause.]

Let my poor scared friend who covers his head with the bed-clothes at night lest he should be devoured by monopolies take courage. The Great Maker of this universe knows how to get His gifts distributed to His children. Since, then, the gratuitous part must be distributed, it follows, as Bastiat claims, that exchange is the barter of values, and value being reduced by competition to represent work, exchange is the barter of equal works, and, therefore, in free trade the richest country gives the most; in fact, it levels itself down and levels the other countries up.

Now, which is the richest, Europe or America? We are all

agreed on that. We say America because our eyes behold it. You say so because your eyes behold it, and you see one thousand millions wasted besides. What do you mean to do? I will tell you what we mean to do. We mean to keep this wealth here. We mean to do it even if we build a "Chinese" wall of tariff taxes around this country. [Applause.]

Let me give this great truth of Bastiat's another application. Nature produces all. That is the origin of the much-abused phrase, "The farmer pays all." Whenever the farmer goes beyond his farm for the gratification of his desires, Bastiat, the free-trader, shows that he must then share his riches. Now whom shall he share it with, the mechanic at home or the mechanic abroad; his fellow-citizen or an alien? Which is for his interest?

Let me put it in other phrase. Which is it better for a farmer to do, send his surplus wheat a thousand miles to the sea-coast, three thousand miles across the water, pay the freight, sell it to the mechanic who gets less wages, or sell it right here at home to the mechanic who gets more wages? The answer seems obvious.

The minor arguments for free trade are exceedingly simple. Reasoning in a circle always is. There is nothing so compact as begging the question. Truth is difficult. "Easy as lying" is a proverb. Says a learned professor, "If under your tariff I can buy for a bushel of wheat in Liverpool the same articles for which I pay in New York a bushel and a peck, will anybody tell me I don't lose a peck of wheat, and lose it by your tariff?" Looks so, doesn't it? [Laughter.]

But there are two assumptions you perceive on examination; first, that under free trade American wheat will be as high at Liverpool and British wares as low. In other words, the learned professor assumes that two bushels of wheat bidding for one set of wares will get them at the same price as when two sets of wares are bidding for one bushel of wheat. Verily this seemeth to be the very thing we are discussing. This was the very point the learned professor started out to prove.

Mr. Frank Hurd, the melodious child of free trade, is now traversing this country founding a great oration on the same convincing argument. If a laborer with two dollars in his pocket won in a day in protectionist America can buy in Liverpool for one dollar what he wants and you make him pay two dollars to the Rhode Island manufacturers, don't you cheat him every day out of half his day? Dear, departed friend, first great martyr in this great cause, why not put it the other way? If a poor laboring man in free-trade America without a cent in his pocket, and perhaps no pocket in his

trousers, should find out that things cost the same in Rhode Island and Liverpool, would the happiness he would undoubtedly feel be anything more than an intellectual delight?

There are only two fallacies in this foundation stone of the new Jerusalem. The little one is that what costs one dollar in Liverpool will cost two in Rhode Island. This is rhetoric. Let us pass the rhetoric. The big one is that the laborer will get his two dollars under free trade, and goods at Liverpool will be as cheap. This is assumption. I not only point out that all this is assertion and not proof, but I think I can prove the contrary.

You asseverate that if part of the people now there left manufactures and went on the land and produced more wheat we could supply ourselves thereby with the manufactures we failed to make and have a profit, because on our fertile lands we can make wheat cheaper than hardware. Perfectly true, if prices would obligingly keep the same.

What makes wheat so cheap to-day? So many unexpected thousand bushels from India. Would not the same number of extra bushels in America have done the same? Would not so many extra bushels from America added to so many extra bushels from India drive it down at more than double the per cent.? British prices are low because the outside world manufacturing for itself won't buy, and these prices have been forced down, say the board to investigate, etc., 57 per cent. from 1873 to 1885. More wheat from America would lower prices of wheat just as more manufactures under tariff have lowered prices of goods. What a jolly rise those same prices would have if we supplied our lost manufactures by import. [Applause.]

The great folly of this most taking free-trade argument is the reasoning from the individual to the nation. If you should suspend the tariff laws for a single man he could, beyond a doubt, buy in Liverpool for a bushel of wheat what in New York costs a bushel and a peck. But would it not be the same if the laws were suspended as to all? By no manner of means. "Why not," says the free-trader; "is not the nation made up of individuals?" Certainly; but compared with one individual the universe is practically unlimited. He can move round and disturb nothing. Sixty millions of him make a big disturbance when they move.

Let me give you an illustration from Wall street. I suppose that when a distinguished man, an ex-minister to England, which is the least of his distinctions, a man whose perceptions are of such delicacy that the present President reminds him of Abraham Lincoln, of blessed memory, has without reproach compared protection to

three-card monte, I may refer to Wall street without censure. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] who, by the wisdom of the Speaker, so well represents the wishes of his State on the Committee on Ways and Means was once an honored director in the Lake Shore and is now an honored director in the Canadian Pacific. Suppose he were to say to one of his friends—to me, for instance, for I like to dream of such a good thing—you have a hundred shares of Lake Shore. They pay 4 per cent. and sell at 92. Canadian Pacific's sell at 59 and pay 3 per cent. Canadian Pacific is a better road. Interstate-commerce bill favors it and the President is friendly. [Laughter.]

Sell your 100 Lake Shore and buy 156 Canadian. You will get \$468 instead of \$400 for income and lots of nice chances. I could do that as per programme. My sale of 100 Lake Shore would not depress that stock. My purchase would not raise the Pacific. But suppose 5000 men tried the same transfer—nay, 500—what would be the result? Canadian Pacific would go up like a rocket and Lake Shore down like a stick, and there would be 500 badly disappointed men, and the more of them there were the more disappointed they would be. If ever the Democratic party, under the lead of the learned professor, on the ground that one man can save a peck of wheat by trading with Liverpool instead of New York, puts this whole nation at the mercy of Liverpool, we shall be a lucky people if we get back the basket.

People say that these tariff discussions are dull and tiresome, but there are always delightful things in them. I don't know when I have bathed my weary soul in such a reverie of bliss as I did while the chairman, by the aid of Edward Atkinson, and the great doctrine of labor-cost, was explaining that the high wages of our work people were not an obstacle, but the very reason itself why the whole circumambient atmosphere should be flooded with the pauper sunshine of Europe. [Laughter.]

The more you pay the workman the less the "labor-cost." The more you give your shoemaker the less the shoes cost. The former, he explained, is the cause of the latter. Less "labor-cost" is produced by higher wages. The higher the wages the lower the labor-cost. No limitation, of course, was set to so divine a principle. The only limit to lowness of "labor-cost" is our generosity to the laboring man. Give infinite dollars to the laboring man and things will cost nothing. [Laughter.] Surely no frantic orator on labor day, the session before election, ever offered to the horny-

handed sons of toil such a sweet boon as the great doctrine of "labor-cost."

But softly, my friends. This is not the millennium. It is not the heavenly Jerusalem newly descended. It is only the old Jerusalem of the Jews, sacred but ancient. It is the old, old fact that the smarter the workman the better the pay, and the manufacturer makes more out of him besides. It is not an absolute fact. It is a relative one. It only means that a better workman in the same country can get better pay than a poor one, and is worth it and a percentage over. It is a valuable fact, but it is an old one; and if Mr. Atkinson, reputed an able man, ever gave such an extension to that idea as his pupil has, he must be one of those men who discover a full-fledged planet with moons whenever an asteroid comes within his field of vision.

But the pleasure given by the great doctrine of "labor-cost" is soon lost in the admiration at the cool courage of what follows. Stimulated by the theory of "labor-cost," the chairman ordered an investigation into the oldest manufactories in New England. What was the result? Why, constantly increasing wages and constantly decreasing cost; the two very things his side has sneered at since tariff debates were invented, higher wages for the worker and lower prices for the consumer.

What industries did he select? Cotton sheetings and cotton prints; cotton goods, the very articles, and perhaps the only articles, which have had continuous, unbroken, effective protection since 1824. He selects industries which, under all tariffs, have had sixty-four years of solid protection, shows by them higher wages for labor and lower prices for consumers, then boldly wraps the flag of labor-cost about him and proclaims to a wondering world that tariff has nothing to do with wages. I wonder what Edward Atkinson thought of his new disciple at that moment.

Oh, no; tariffs have nothing to do with wages. It is coal and steam and machinery. But what set up the machinery? What caused the cotton factory to be built? Why, the tariff. So, then, the tariff built the mill, set up the machinery, the machinery increased the wages, but the tariff did not. Is not that very much like saying your father was your progenitor, but your grandfather wasn't? [Laughter.] How could you improve machinery you didn't have? How could you increase the efficiency of machinery that didn't exist?

Perhaps now would be a good time to introduce the Chairman's yard of cassimere. I hate to invite this respectable audience into even this small Sahara of figures; but really there are oases in it.

In the original it is one line and a half, specimen of a whole column. Here it is: .

"One yard of cassimere, weighing 16 ounces, costs 138 cents; the labor-cost is 29 cents; the tariff is 80 cents." Borrowing from the rest of the column he means, as you will see if you read it, "You pretend, you manufacturers, that you want a tariff for the laborer; and here you are, 29 cents to the laborer and 80 cents tariff: 51 cents into your infamous pockets."

This is certainly bad. I do not remember ever seeing such a startling exposure of cold-blooded villainy. Why, a robber baron of the middle ages, dead and buried five hundred years ago, with nothing left of him but his coffin, would rise at such a charge and hurl back as indignant contempt as if he had been a Kentucky member charged with refusing hearings on midnight revenue reform. But let us repress our feelings. May be that this news is like the news we used to get from Texas during the war, "Important if true." And it is not true. A yard of cassimere selling at 138 cents, weighing 16 ounces, and paying 80 cents tariff is an impossibility. Just permit me to prove it.

First you take off 27 cents discount for selling. This includes all other incidentals. That leaves 111 cents. Take off 80 cents, the alleged tariff. That leaves 31 cents. That is cost. You see I am liberal. No extras there. Now, if 31 cents is the cost and the goods are invoiced honestly—you see, I am again liberal—what is the duty? It will be largest under the woolen schedule. Therefore we will take that. It can only be 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. The 35 cents is compensatory for the wool duty paid by the manufacturer. The 35 cents is 35 cents. Add 35 per cent of 31 cents—10.85 cents—and you have 45.85 cents, which must be your tariff. But 45.85 cents added to 31 cents cost and 27 cents for selling gives only 103.85 cents instead of 138 cents, which shows that the sum doesn't prove.

Now listen to what the rate must be: 138 cents is the agreed price; 27 cents off for selling leaves 111. Now, the fixed specific tariff on a pound of cassimere is 35 cents. Take that out and there remains 76 cents for cost and ad valorem duty at 35 per cent. In other words, 76 is 135 per cent. of the cost. Therefore the cost is 56.29 cents, and the ad valorem tariff is 19.71, which added to the 35 cents specific is 54.71 cents. Adding them all together you have 138 cents. This proves. Now let us see what ratio this bears to the rest of the calculation of the learned chairman. Eighty cents tariff, taking out 29 for labor, gave the heartless manufacturer 51 cents; 54.71 cents will only leave him 25.71.

Can he get away with that? How lucky he would be if he could. Out of that he has got to pay just 35 cents to the woolman, tariff on his wool. In fact, the 35 cents a pound in the tariff is put there for that very purpose. So, according to the chairman's theory, this poor robber baron has got to put his hands into his own pockets and pay 9.29 cents of his own money besides what he gets from tariff. Really any intelligent robber baron would go back to the middle ages, where he certainly had no such luck. [Laughter and applause.]

Of course these figures are of no real earthly value except to prove the absurdity of a line and a half specimen of the chairman's speech. He started out grandly. Go to, he said, I will pay this man's labor and show he pockets 51 cents a yard besides; all out of the tariff. The chairman does not realize that 51 cents a yard profit on cassimere is a colossal preposterousness. He does not have even a suspicion of it.

Between the two kinds of free-trade orators the manufacturers have a poor chance. One of them, like the chairman, proves the inordinate profit of 51 cents a yard, and shouts loudly against the infinite extortion and the piled-up wealth. The other, like the member from Massachusetts [Mr. Russell], who seems to have a valuable assortment of unknown facts, proclaims the wide-spread bankruptcy of woolen manufacturers and then wants to know, in an equally loud tone of voice, how we defend such a beggarly business as this. When one insinuates 51 cents profit for every yard, and the other testifies to bankruptcy, we have between them a millionaire insolvent and a beggar rolling in wealth. [Laughter.]

When the chairman asserts more than 60 per cent. profit on woollens and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Russell] declares that no nation but ours taxes imported wool, while the last publication of the State Department shows at least sixteen, one hardly knows which to admire most, the stupendous imagination of the gentleman from Texas or the rigorous accuracy of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

After all, this exaggerated idea of the profits of manufacturers is at the bottom of the chairman's feelings. Whenever I walk through the streets of that Democratic importing city of New York and look at the brownstone fronts my gorge always rises. I can never understand why the virtue which I know is on the sidewalk is not thus rewarded. I do not feel kindly to the people inside. But when I feel that way I know what the feeling is. It is good, honest, high-minded envy. When some other gentlemen have the same feeling they think it's political economy! [Great laughter.]

Why have I spent so much time on this wretched little yard of cassimere? Simply because it is a sample of a whole column which has been put forward here as the finest result of the free-trade intellect; and there are eighteen more just such palterings with common-sense.

Before I leave cassimere let me add one word. One of the chiefest arguments on the stump of the free-trader is that our tariff taxes are on the necessities of life. Why shouldn't they be, if protection makes cheaper? The chairman has already shown how cheap cotton is. Let Matthew Arnold tell about woolens. Here I have him in the *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1888:

On the other hand, for that immense class of people, the great bulk of the community, . . . things in America are favorable. . . . Society is organized for their benefit. . . . Luxuries are, as I have said, very dear, above all European luxuries, but the workingman's clothing is nearly as cheap as in England, and plain food is, on the whole, cheaper. Even luxuries of a certain kind are within the laboring man's easy reach.

I have thus gone over, well or ill, the real arguments on the other side, all that are really worth touching, as there is in all these rhetorical battles much artillery firing which comes from unshotted guns. They make as much noise as real artillery. They obscure the heavens also with much smoke, and they seem to the careless to contribute to the dead and wounded. Some of these I must ask you to examine, for it is really worth while to see what a part smoke and noise play in this world.

"Monopoly," said Horace Greeley, a doctor of laws, and once a candidate of the Democratic party for the Presidency, "monopoly is, perhaps, the most perverted and misapplied word in our much-abused mother-tongue." How very tame this language is. I suppose that during the ten years last past I have listened in this Hall to more idiotic raving, more pestiferous rant, on that subject than on all the others put together. And yet I do not regret it. What a beautiful sight it is to see the revenue-reform orator go into action against monopoly. Nelson, as he stood blazing with decorations on the decks of the *Victory* on the fatal day of Trafalgar; Napoleon at Friedland, as the Guard went cheering and charging by; Thomas Sayers as he stripped for the championship of England when Heenan had crossed the lifting waters; the eagle scaring to his eyrie; the royal man-eating Bengal tiger in his native jungle; nay, the very bull himself, the strong bull of Bashan, as he uplifts his bellow over the rocky deserts of Palestine, are all but pale reminders of one of these

majestic creatures. [Laughter.] And yet, outside the Patent Office there are no monopolies in this country, and there never can be. Ah, but what is that I see on the far horizon's edge, with tongue of lambent flame and eye of forked fire, serpent-headed and griffin-clawed? Surely it must be the great new chimera "Trust." Quick, cries every masked member of the Ways and Means. Quick, let us lower the tariff. Let us call in the British. Let them save our devastated homes. Courage, dear brethren. Be not too much disturbed. The Lord will reign even if the board of mayor and aldermen should adjourn.

Call in the British! When the day comes that this Republic cannot save itself from a dozen of its own citizens without aid from over the sea, I hope to be buried a thousand leagues under some respectable and permanent mountain range. What unreasonable talk this is. A dozen men fix the prices for sixty million freemen! They can never do it. There is no power on earth that can raise the price of any necessity of life above a just price and keep it there. More than that, if the price is raised and maintained even for a short while, it means ruin for the combination and still lower prices for consumers. That is one of the laws of God working for His children. Compared with one of your laws of Congress, it is a *Leviathan* to a clam.

Doubtless there are evils in this word to be corrected by law. But let us go at it with sense. The kindly bear who flung a paving stone to drive away a fly which disturbed his sleeping friend killed the man and did not hurt the fly.

But if the revenue-reform orator on the monopoly is terrible, like an army with banners, there is a theme on which he can take up the notes of the dying swan. How we do love to hear him on the impoverished farmer. Then he is not sublime, but he is pathetically great. I heard him first ten years ago. To me, innocent, untraveled, it seemed as if the Western farmer was the most woe-begone, down-trodden, luckless, unsuccessful, dispirited devil on the face of the earth. The Eastern vampire had mortgaged his farm and thrown down his fences, and scattered his substance wantonly to the winds.

In the fullness of time I traveled West myself. You may well imagine my astonishment, who had never seen 10 acres together in corn, to behold fields of that great staple stretching way out to the horizon's edge, to see tracts of land which seemed to have no boundaries but the visible sky; land so rich that if we had an acre of it in Maine we would have sold it by the bushel [laughter],

while on every side were the great brick houses, such as only the squire lived in in our villages. After some days of this I became sulky. I said, gentlemen, of course we have robbed you; your Congressmen would not lie about trifles like that. But what disgusts me is that we did not do it more thoroughly. The gleanings look bigger than the harvest. These crumbs are finer than the food we put on our tables. Then they confided to me that the Western Congressmen were great orators and did this for practice. [Laughter.] Since then I have not been so much moved by it.

Here is another unshot gun called "the markets of the world." The markets of the world! How broad and cool these words are. They stretch from the frozen regions of the northern pole across [the blazing tropics to the ice-bound shores of the Antarctic continent. All this we can have if we will but give up the little handbreadth called the United States of America. What are these markets of the world?

To hear these rhetoricians declaim, you would imagine the markets of the world a vast vacuum, waiting till now for American goods to break through, rush in, and fill the yearning void. Will your goods go to Austria, to Italy, Germany, Russia, or France? Around all these benighted countries are the "Chinese" walls of tariff taxes. Britain herself is protected by vast capital, accumulated through ages, the spoils of her own and other lands, by a trade system as powerful as it is relentless. All these nations will contest with you the other countries which they already overflow.

Does your mouth water over the prospect? What market do you give up for all this? Where is the best market in the world? Where the people have the most money to spend. Where have the people the most money to spend? Right here in the United States of America after twenty-seven years of protectionist rule. And you are asked to give up such a market for the markets of the world! Why, the history of such a transaction was told twenty-four hundred years ago. It is a classic. You will find it in the works of Æsop, the fabulist.

Once there was a dog. He was a nice little dog. Nothing the matter with him except a few foolish free-trade ideas in his head. He was trotting along happy as the day, for he had in his mouth a nice shoulder of succulent mutton. By and by he came to a stream bridged by a plank. He trotted along, and, looking over the side of the plank, he saw the markets of the world and dived for them. A minute after he was crawling up the bank the wettest,

the sickest [great laughter], the nastiest, the most muttonless dog that ever swam ashore!

We have now spent twenty days in the discussion of the Mills bill. Have you noticed what has been the most utterly insignificant thing in the discussion? The most utterly insignificant thing in the discussion has been the Mills bill. How do you account for it? I will tell you. If the principles you have enunciated are true, it is an unworthy compromise with Satan. If the principles we have stated are true, it is an unworthy ambushade, and you know it. You mean this merely for one step. You mean to cut deeper next time. You mean the destruction of the system which now exists.

The whole case can be put succinctly in a few words. If the principles you announce are true, you must have direct taxation. If the dollar you pay the custom-house on the import is followed by a dollar to the manufacturer for every like quantity of domestic goods, which your tariff accidentally encourages, then that manufacture is a misfortune. It takes dollars out of the farmer or lawyer without return. It is no reply, under this Government, to say that the indirect collection of two dollars, one half of which is lost to the people, is easier because the poor fools don't know it.

That is the old quotation made from Colbert by the gentleman from West Virginia. Surely in this country you do not avow that you are trying to get "the maximum of feathers out of the goose for the minimum of squalling." You don't mean to take feathers out of the American goose and deny him the poor privilege of noise. No, if our proud bird ought to surrender feathers he is plucky enough to surrender like an eagle, and if it is a tax alone he has a right to see just what feathers go.

The forefathers of these Democrats saw this, and, like the honest men they were, clamored for direct taxation. They were right. Why do not you act like them? Why not be bold? Why do you hesitate? It is because twenty-seven years of knowledge divide you from them. In your heart of hearts you suspect your own logic and you dare not. You may well hesitate. Whoever takes down the map of 1860 and the map of 1888 will look upon the most wondrous growth that ever the sun shone on in all its myriad courses around the earth. It is a marvelous spectacle. It is not alone the great cities, born like exhalations, which flash prosperity over the great lakes, over the broad plains, over the mighty fields rich with verdure or teeming with uncounted harvest. It is not alone the piled-up billions under which the great national debt caused by the greatest war expenditure the world ever saw has melted like an iceberg under a

tropic sun. It is not alone the rejuvenated South turning its face to its great future. Nay, it is not even all of these combined. It is the fact found by the most cultured Englishman of our day that all this wealth and prosperity has been so shaped that it seeks the comfort—not of the rich, not of the lounging owner of fixed income, not of the pampered minion of governmental power, but of the plain people whom Abraham Lincoln loved, and who are of right the chief glory of this Republic. [Prolonged applause.]

HON. BENTON McMILLIN, OF TENNESSEE.

(Democratic Side.)

Next in importance to personal liberty is the question of how and how much the people shall be taxed; and this is the subject for consideration to-day. As it pertains to taxation it is no new question, but was with us in the beginning of our Government, and will be with us to its close. He who advocates the present tariff favors a tariff not for revenue, not for protection merely, but a tariff for surplus and a tariff for trusts.

We are confronted with an anomalous state of affairs. We have, locked up in the Treasury, beyond the demands of the Government, about \$108,000,000 and will have \$150,000,000 in June, or \$2.50 for every inhabitant—more than \$230 for every day since the Saviour was born into the world. What is the cause of this overflowing Treasury? What is the cause of this accumulation beside which that of all other countries sinks into insignificance? What is the cause of hoarding in the Treasury at Washington more money than is gathered into the treasury of any monarchy, kingdom, or despotism under the sun? The answer to all these questions is, the people have been taxed beyond the reasonable demands of the Government. Robbery of them under the forms of law has been perpetrated; and to-day they stand moneyless, the tax-gatherer staring them in the face, and demand relief at our hands. Will we give it, or will we withhold it?

LABOR TROUBLES.

I have had access to the advance sheets of the forthcoming third annual report of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor. I wish to quote from it to show that twenty-seven years of alleged protection has not resulted in that peace, quiet, and prosperity to the laborers which it was claimed would follow it.

In the six years from 1881 to 1886 there have been strikes in 22,336 establishments. Of these, 16,692, or 74.74 per cent., were in the States

of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Illinois, where protection is claimed to have wrought such wonders for the laboring man.

There were lockouts during the same period in 2,182 establishments. Of these 1,981, or 90.8 per cent., occurred in the five States named. The number of employes striking and involved was 1,324,152. In addition to these there were 159,548 employes locked out, 31.22 per cent. of whom were females.

Of the 22,336 establishments in which strikes occurred, the strikes in 18,342, or 82.12 per cent. of the whole, were ordered by labor organizations; while of the 2,182 establishments in which lockouts occurred, 1,753, or 80.34 per cent., were ordered by combinations of managers.

Concerning the loss to employes resulting from these disturbances the report will say:

Understanding, then, the difficulties in ascertaining the exact loss of employers and employes as resulting from strikes and lockouts, reference may be had to the summaries, where the information which has been collected is grouped. The loss to the strikers, as given in these tables, for the period involved was \$51,819,163. The loss to employes through lockouts for the same period was \$8,132,717; or a total wage loss to employes of \$59,951,880. This loss occurred for both strikes and lockouts in 24,518 establishments, or an average loss of \$2,445 to each establishment, and of nearly \$40 to each person involved.

Will any gentleman say, in the face of these great disturbances, that the condition of the labor of this country is entirely satisfactory to the laborer? Has he derived that unmixed blessing from high taxation which was promised him? The tendency of our present legislation, I regret to say, is to make millionaires and paupers. Under the lower tariff rates of years gone by, when taxation was imposed to carry on the Government, the word "tramp" was not daily and hourly heard. The anarchist, the socialist, and the communist were also unknown in our midst.

Our rate of wages is higher than the rate in the Old World, and would be under any tariff law that we would impose. The gentleman from Texas has very tersely demonstrated the fact that the higher our wages the lower the labor cost of the product. If tariffs give high wages, why is it that labor in England is so much higher than it is in France or Germany, the latter countries having protective tariffs and England having none? Why is it that our manufacturing journals of this country begin to declare that the danger

of our people lies in the cheap labor of Germany instead of the cheap labor of England?

With the highest-priced labor in the world, we send over their tariffs to Germany and France, having the cheap labor, machinery, stoves, ranges, hardware, tools, machine-needles, mechanical and scientific instruments, cutlery, fire-arms, printing-presses, locks, hinges, sewing-machines, clocks, watches, and pianos, and so far as I have been able to trace the relation I find that the more labor we get into a commodity the more certainly we can compete successfully with the old country. One of the manufacturers of pianos alone in this country sends five hundred pianos per annum to England.

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

I congratulate the country that we have reached the point where there is a fair chance for the consideration of a bill looking to the reduction of the taxes on the necessities of life. Heretofore the favorite method pursued in the killing of tariff bills was either by refusing to consider them or by striking out the enacting clause. But I think we are fortunate in having before us now a bill which this Congress dare not refuse to consider, and of which its members dare not be rash enough to strike out the enacting clause. For many years different Presidents have called upon Congress to discharge its duty and diminish taxation.

President Arthur called the attention of Congress, in his first annual message, to our excessive taxation in the following language:

It seems to me that the time has arrived when the people may justly demand some relief from their present onerous burden.

In his second he said:

I heartily approve the Secretary's recommendation of immediate and extensive reductions in the annual revenues of the Government.

In 1883, even after the present law was passed, in his annual message he said he had no doubt that still further reductions might be wisely made.

But not ready to settle the question, Congress shifted its responsibility off to a tariff commission, and sent a band of itinerant patriots around the country to report what ought to be done. That commission consisted of men who were appointed from different industries because of their known favor to them; but the public clamor for tax reduction was so great and the necessity for it so patent that even

they could not ignore the fact, and they reported that there should be a reduction of from 20 to 25 per cent. The Congress that appointed them, finding the rate of taxation averaged about 43 per cent., under the pretense of revising it, left it so that it has since reached 47 per cent., and the people have had no relief. It is higher to-day than it was any time during the late civil war.

Worn out with waiting, disgusted with the hesitation of the Congress that misrepresented the best interests of the country, they freed themselves from those who appointed the commission and refused to heed ~~its~~ recommendation, and sent here a different class of representatives, and to the White House a man of a different political party.

President Cleveland, in his first annual message, urged Congress to give this relief; and the Ways and Means Committee reported a bill making reductions averaging about 20 per cent.; but the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, aided by a few on this, refused to even consider the bill, declined to make any effort to better it. A good many were left at home, and others were sent here in their stead, and still the question is here.

I quote the following from the last annual message of President Cleveland, who seems to have felt the gravity of the situation, and had all the manly courage and able statesmanship necessary to discharge fearlessly his duty and let the consequences take care of themselves:

When we consider that the theory of our institutions guarantees to every citizen the full enjoyment of all the fruits of his industry and enterprise, with only such deduction as may be his share towards the careful and economical maintenance of the Government which protects him, it is plain that the exaction of more than this is indefensible extortion and a culpable betrayal of American fairness and justice. This wrong inflicted upon those who bear the burden of national taxation, like other wrongs, multiplies a brood of evil consequences. The public Treasury, which should only exist as a conduit, conveying the people's tribute to its legitimate objects of expenditure, becomes a hoarding-place for money needlessly withdrawn from trade and the people's use, thus crippling our national energies, suspending our country's development, preventing investment in productive enterprise, threatening financial disturbance, and inviting schemes of public plunder.

I will be pardoned for commenting a little more upon the surplus that is accumulating and the evils that are likely to grow out of it. We are drawing money from commerce and locking it up in the Treasury at such a rate that it is only a question of time when stringency will set in, panics begin, and ruin follow. We are rob-

bing not only commerce of its life-blood, but the people of the means of paying their taxes to their governments—municipal, county, State, and Federal—and their debts to their creditors. All sorts of jobs are proposed to Congress and all sorts of jobbers are flocking here. There is nothing conceivable more corrupting to government than a plethoric treasury. It revives stale demands; it encourages the prosecution of matters long since set at rest.

WHO RESISTED TARIFF REDUCTION?

The gentlemen of the minority in presenting their views have commented with severity upon the fact that hitherto the Democratic party has not reduced taxation. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKinley] is credited with the authorship of that document. Listen to the arraignment with which he adorns the pages of his florid production:

If it be claimed that for the most part during the Democratic control of the House the Senate was dominated by the Republican party, and therefore the responsibility of failure to reduce the revenues should be alike shared by them, we answer that under the Constitution of the United States the House alone can originate bills to reduce taxation, the Senate having no jurisdiction of the subject until it is given to it by a bill which passes the House, and that during all these years no such bill has gone from the House to the Senate, and therefore the sole responsibility for failure rests with the present majority in the House of Representatives.

Now, sir, I know of no better person to answer this charge made by the gentleman from Ohio than the gentleman from Ohio himself. He made a speech in Congress a few years ago in which he with equal severity arraigned the Democratic party for attempting to reduce taxation. I quote from that speech, and it will be observed that in this last quotation, which was his first utterance, he takes upon himself and the small number of Democrats whom he could get to act with him the responsibility with which he now charges the Democratic party:

The Democratic majorities in the Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, and Forty-sixth Congresses, although committed by party utterances and by platforms, as well as the pledges of leaders, to a reduction of duties to a revenue basis, were unable, with all their party machinery and the free use of the party lash, to accomplish even a step in that direction. Every proposition for a change was met with the almost solid opposition of this side of the House, which, with the assistance of a few Representatives on the other side from

Pennsylvania and the New England States, was strong enough to insure and did insure the substantial defeat of every measure looking to a disturbance of the existing tariff rates.

What shall we think of statesmanship which, forgetting its own record, charges upon its antagonist that which it has confessed to be its own fault ?

INTERNAL REVENUE.

Sir, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley] has delivered an able and characteristic speech, clamoring for the total repeal of the internal-revenue system. He arraigns the Democratic party for not repealing it; and without stint or moderation he uncorked and poured forth his vials of wrath upon that system and upon those who now refuse, at his behest, to create a deficiency by repealing it. Was the Democratic party the author of this law ? Did the Democratic party put it upon the statute-book ? Did we enact those stringent provisions under which citizens have been incarcerated, under which property has been seized and destroyed without process of law, and under which the Federal courts of the country have been filled to overflowing with men charged with violation of the internal-revenue laws ? No, sir.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania imposed other internal taxes at the same time. He put a tax upon incomes, and a tax upon railroads. He put a tax upon the capital and deposits of national banks. They were taxes on accumulated wealth, which at all times should be made to help support the Government that protects it. Those taxes have all been removed, and by his help; but the one that he says works hardship he never removed. Imagine my surprise when I turn back to the RECORD and see among those who enacted this law the name of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. When charging long and loud that we refused to repeal the system, does he forget that only five years ago he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, was the leader of the House of Representatives in the Republican organization, and that upon him devolved the responsibility of framing a bill for the reduction of taxation to relieve the people from burdens ?

Does he forget that ten years before that occurred he had announced publicly, privately, and everywhere that he was in favor of the repeal of the internal-revenue system, and yet does he now forget that he failed then to do, or even to propose to do, the very thing which he now says the Democratic party is culpable for not doing ? Then he had responsibility resting upon him, and was care-

ful about his action. He said then that he favored taking them off, but did not do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. He proposed to repeal the internal taxes—

Mr. McMILLIN. I remember the gentleman's utterances. I remember his coming before this House and saying he favored the repeal of that system, but that his caucus had determined otherwise and that he bowed his neck to the yoke. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. Has not that been done with like effect now by the Democratic caucus?

Mr. McMILLIN. No, sir. Why does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania offer a substitute now and show that his side would repeal those taxes if the responsibility rested upon them to-day?

Mr. KELLEY. When we come to amendments you will find that I will offer one, and make you vote on it, too. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Does your party favor a total repeal of internal taxes?

Mr. KELLEY. I speak for myself [jeers on the Democratic side], and say I do.

Mr. McMILLIN. Who will speak for your party if you, the oldest member on that side, will not? [Applause.]

I do not propose to vote for such an amendment while its adoption would create a deficiency of \$60,000,000 a year, which would have to be raised by increase of taxes on necessities. [Applause on the Democratic side].

And I think I voice the Democratic party when I say they will not do so. [Applause.]

When I come to a point, Mr. Chairman, where I have to select the subjects upon which I will place taxation, I believe it is sound political policy to place it upon those things that the people can do without, which are not essential to their very comfort and existence, rather than upon the necessities of life. I have striven to mollify internal-revenue laws, and by this bill more is done in that direction than by any other ever proposed to Congress since the system was inaugurated.

Now, when interrupted I was going on to state the facts concerning the internal-revenue system. It yields, in round numbers, one hundred and twenty millions of revenue to the Government. The annual surplus is only about sixty millions; so that if all the internal-revenue laws were repealed, it would leave a deficiency in our taxes of sixty millions a year. What is this deficiency to be raised from? Shall we reimpose a tax on tea and coffee? No. There is

not a man here who would retax coffee to untax whisky. Shall we increase the duties on woolen goods, rice, or sugar? No; for the people would not and should not tolerate any such legislation. Then, sir, we have to select the subjects from which we will reduce taxes; and in view of the fact that we cannot repeal the internal-revenue system, we have to determine whether we will reduce the tax on whisky or the tax on clothing; the tax on whisky or the tax on sugar. In other words, reduce the tax on that without which men can live and prosper, or upon that which is essential to their very comfort and existence. When it narrows itself down to a contest between the drinking man's appetite and the poor man's back, I do not hesitate to say that we espouse the cause of the back, and defy the world, the flesh, and the devil in the fight. [Laughter and applause.]

No, sir, the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not repeal the internal taxes when the opportunity was presented to him. He would not do so to-day if upon him rested the responsibility of leadership of this House. Not only did he not do that, but he did not repeal those oppressive and obnoxious statutes without which the system could have been run in the beginning and can be successfully operated now. But there was a class to whose rescue he rushed. There was a class when they held up their hands to the distinguished gentleman and said "Help me, Cassius, or I sink," for whom he braved the tide and the waves, and rushed into the flood to their rescue. There had been a tax imposed upon the capital and deposits of banks and on checks. If it ever landed anybody into the Federal courts, we did not hear of it. If it ever bankrupted anybody, we never knew it. If it ever worked any serious hardship, the man has not appeared upon whom it was wrought. It yielded to the Government more than eleven millions of dollars annually. It was a tax on wealth; yet these were the people in whose behalf, with feverish anxiety and impetuous haste, the gentleman from Pennsylvania made his exertions.

Your patent-medicine man, "Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup," perfumery and cosmetics, and all manner of nostrums, were also the recipients of his statecraft and patriotic efforts, but when it came to free the citizen from the oppression that destroyed his property—without due process of law—it was so insignificant a subject that the distinguished gentleman never made an exertion to mollify the hardship of any law or to better the condition of any citizen..

Listen to the plaintive wail with which the gentleman from Pennsylvania speaks of the oppressions of taxation when it is imposed on national banks, those poor corporations created by the Government, to whom it has loaned its credit with such lavish hands, and that

have never paid a single dollar of taxes on the bonds upon which their circulation is founded to the county, State, or National Government:

I confess that I cannot see the reason that animates any man to wantonly retain a tax on bankers for the mere purpose of branding them invidiously and locking up in idleness in the Treasury of the United States the taxes abstracted from them.—*Congressional Record*, Forty-seventh Congress, first session, page 5192.

But the distinguished gentleman has not the same sympathetic anxiety for the man who pays high taxes on sugar, high taxes on salt, high taxes on clothing. Although such a man has no money deposited in bank; although he has no bonds that are not taxable upon which he gets a circulation to be loaned out to the people; although he lives after the commandment of God, "by the sweat of his brow," my distinguished friend is not able to see that it is wrong to take money from him that the Government does not need and lock it up in the Treasury. It makes all the difference in the world with the gentleman from Pennsylvania whose ox is gored. He says the passage of this bill will instantly paralyze the enterprise and energy of the people. How reducing the cost of salt, cotton goods, woolen clothes, and tin roofing will paralyze any man is hard to understand.

What is the bill that we present for your consideration? It is a bill which proposes to take \$878,000 off of chemicals; \$1,756,000 off of earthen and glass ware; \$11,480,000 off of sugar; \$331,000 off of provisions; \$227,000 off of cotton goods; \$2,042,000 off of hemp, jute, and flax goods; \$12,330,000 off of woollens; \$3,000 off of books and papers, and \$1,090,000 off of sundries. It is also proposed to add to your free-list flax, hemp, jute, chemicals, salt, tin plate, wool, and other things, amounting to \$22,189,000, making in all a tariff reduction of \$53,720,000. It proposes to make reductions in the internal revenue of \$24,455,000, or a grand total of tax reduction from tariff and internal revenue sources of \$78,176,000—more than a dollar and a quarter to every individual, or \$6 for every family in the United States. And the plain, simple question presented here to-day is: Will we take this burden off or will we leave it on? Will we free commerce, leaving it unshackled, or will we keep it hampered? Will we continue to hoard up a corrupting surplus or will we leave the money in the pockets of the people, where it justly belongs? These are the subjects upon which we are to act. The following table I have prepared to show the rates of duty existing and proposed.

	Per cent.
Present rate on dutiable goods.....	47.10
Proposed rate on dutiable goods.....	40.00
Present rate on articles affected by bill.....	54.16
Proposed rate on articles affected by bill.....	33.36

Several of the schedules of the more luxurious articles are not touched.

What more have we proposed for your adoption? We recommend to you very material changes in the laws governing the collection of the internal revenue. Heretofore, by statutes of the United States, internal-revenue officers have been authorized, upon the seizure of property which they suppose to be used in illicit distilling, to destroy it in advance of presentment or indictment of the owner or trial, and hence to destroy it without due process of law upon mere suspicion. We recommend that you change this, believing that the Government should not set the example of destroying the property of the citizen until after he has had a chance for a hearing before some tribunal of his country.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania spent much of his time and most of his fervor in a tirade against Kentucky, and attributes her want of development of her resources to the tax on whisky. He advocates the removal of that tax. I am not going into an extended defense of that magnificent State or her grand people. They speak for themselves, and besides have representatives here who are amply able to take care of her, even when assaulted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. But I want to stir up his pure mind by way of remembrance on one little thing or two of which he seems to have been profoundly oblivious when traducing that State. He had forgotten the fact that the last annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shows that whereas Kentucky has 3,702 retail dealers in spirits and malt liquors, Pennsylvania has 20,425. Comparing these figures with the census—and we have no reliable data as to population since—it gives one saloon for every four hundred and forty-five inhabitants in Kentucky and one to every two hundred and nine inhabitants in the great State of Pennsylvania. I have to announce to this House and the country that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has revolutionized on the question of free raw materials. He stands here to-day clamoring for it. Not free raw materials for his factories and furnaces; not free raw materials for his forges and foundries; not free raw materials for his carpet looms and woolen establishments, but he is exceedingly anxious for free raw materials for his twenty thousand saloons.

He announced in a speech some years ago that the consumer pays

the tax imposed upon the commodity. It is not surprising, therefore, that holding to that faith he should wish a little less internal tax on this very flourishing industry.

PRESIDENT GRANT ON FREE WOOL.

The minority of the Committee on Ways and Means, and other gentlemen opposing tax reduction, have laid a great deal of stress on the injustice done by the proposed removal of the duty on wool and other articles added to the free-list. I submit for their consideration the fact that among the earliest suggestions—so far as I know, the earliest suggestion—since the war for the removal of the duty on wool came from the distinguished Chief Executive whom they twice honored with an election to the Presidency and attempted to elevate to that position a third time, President Grant. In his annual message submitted to Congress December 7, 1874, he made the following recommendation:

I would suggest to Congress the propriety of readjusting the tariff so as to increase the revenue and at the same time decrease the number of articles upon which duties are levied. Those articles which enter into our manufactures and are not produced at home, it seems to me, should be entered free. Of those articles of manufacture which we produce a constituent part of but do not produce the whole, that part which we do not produce should enter free also. I will instance fine wool, dyes, etc. These articles must be imported to form a part of the manufacture of the higher grades of woolen goods. Chemicals used as dyes, compounded in medicines and used in various ways in manufactures, come under this class. The introduction, free of duty, of such wools as we do not produce would stimulate the manufacture of goods requiring the use of those we do produce, and therefore would be a benefit to home production. There are many articles entering into home manufacture which we do not produce ourselves, the tariff upon which increases the cost of producing the manufactured article. All corrections in this regard are in the direction of bringing labor and capital in harmony with each other, and of supplying one of the elements of prosperity so much needed.

It will also be remembered in this connection that the first tariff law adopted was framed by Madison, the father of the Constitution, and contemporaneous with the public service President Washington and Mr. Jefferson left wool on the free list. I would digress also far enough in this connection to ask why is it that in all the years from that time until 1801 there never was a tariff that aggregated 31 per cent.?

Of all the sufferers by this oppressive taxation the farmer is the greatest. With wheat at less than 80 cents, cotton at a rate that

barely pays for production, corn so low that it will scarcely bear shipment, he toils from eight to fourteen hours a day and gets none of the benefits of the high tax. He has to sell his commodities in the lowest markets of the world and buy in the highest. The result on him has been disastrous in the extreme. The records of agricultural regions show a frightful increase of mortgages. The mortgages upon the farmers of the Northwest are startling to contemplate.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND ON THE INTERESTS OF LABOR.

There is a statement made and reiterated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania which I think deserves more than a passing notice. It is that wherein he speaks of the President's message as a "free-trade message." The minority report also uses that phrase to characterize it. I am not willing that the opinions of the country shall be based upon the assertions of gentlemen who are averse to the President in every political sentiment. I therefore read from the message itself, that this House and the country may determine whether or not it is a free-trade document:

It is not proposed to entirely relieve the country of this tariff taxation. It must be extensively continued as the source of the Government's income, and in a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered, as well as the preservation of our manufacturers. It may be called protection, or by any other name, but relief from the hardships and dangers of our present tariff laws should be devised with especial precaution against imperiling the existence of our manufacturing interests.

Again:

It is also said that the increase in the price of domestic manufactures resulting from the present tariff is necessary in order that higher wages may be paid to our workingmen employed in manufactories than are paid for what is called the pauper labor of Europe. All will acknowledge the force of an argument which involves the welfare and liberal compensation of our laboring people. Our labor is honorable in the eyes of every American citizen, and as it lies at the foundation of our development and progress it is entitled, without affectation or hypocrisy, to the utmost regard. The standard of our laborers' life should not be measured by that of any other country less favored, and they are entitled to their full share of all our advantages.

The following paragraph also bears upon this subject:

To these the appeal is made to save their employment and maintain their wages by resisting a change. There should be no disposition to answer such suggestions by the allegation that they are in a minority among those who

labor, and therefore should forego an advantage in the interest of low prices for the majority; their compensation, as it may be affected by the operation of tariff laws, should at all times be scrupulously kept in view; and yet with slight reflection they will not overlook the fact that they are consumers with the rest; that they, too, have their own wants and those of their families to supply from their earnings, and that the price of the necessities of life as well as the amount of their wages will regulate the measure of their welfare and comfort.

But the reduction of taxation demanded should be so measured as not to necessitate or justify either the loss of employment by the workingman nor the lessening of his wages; and the profits still remaining to the manufacturer, after a necessary readjustment, should furnish no excuse for the sacrifice of the interests of his employés either in their opportunity to work or in the diminution of their compensation.

I wish to compare the record of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley] with that of the distinguished President of the United States, whose message he criticises. Let us compare their action on one subject that is of vital importance to the laboring man, and see if we cannot get some additional light. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a member of Congress in 1864, and on the anniversary of our country's liberty an act was passed by him and those acting with him which has only to be read to be most heartily despised. It is what is now known as the "contract-labor law." There was a clause in the Constitution which forbade the re-establishment of the African slave-trade, but this opening of something like a Caucasian slave-trade was made legitimate by the statute which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That all contracts that shall be made by emigrants to the United States in foreign countries, in conformity to regulations that may be established by the said commissioner, whereby emigrants shall pledge the wages of their labor for a term not exceeding twelve months, to repay the expenses of their emigration, shall be held to be valid in law, and may be enforced in the courts of the United States or of the several States and Territories; and such advances, if so stipulated in the contract, and the contract be recorded in the recorder's office in the country where the emigrant shall settle, shall operate as a lien upon any land thereafter acquired by the emigrant, whether under the homestead law when the title is consummated, or on property otherwise acquired until liquidated by the emigrant; but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to authorize any contract contravening the Constitution of the United States, or creating in any way the relation of slavery or servitude, (U. S. Stats. at Large, vol. 15, 1863-'65.)

Mr. WEAVER. Who signed the act which has been read?

Mr. McMILLIN. It passed during President Lincoln's term; but I do not know whether it received his signature or became a law by ten days' limitation.

Mr. KELLEY. Will you let me say a word in defense of Lincoln?

Mr. McMILLIN. Until the gentleman gets through defending himself he will have to let Lincoln alone. "Physician, heal thyself." It is not Lincoln who is in danger; it is my friend from Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. Do not violate Lincoln's grave.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman cannot take refuge behind the grave-stone of that great and patriotic man. [Applause.]

Not only were foreigners to be brought here by contract, but their services for a year were made liable for the fulfillment of the contracts, and any little home which they acquired by purchase, or even under the homestead act, was to be swept away from them and their children to satisfy the rapacity of the contractors who brought them over. Whenever the operatives in an American mine or at an American furnace became dissatisfied with their wages and struck for better pay, all that the mine or furnace owner had to do was to send his agent abroad to the densely populated regions, to the poor and squalid inhabitants of Russia, Poland, Italy, or other oppressed region, contract for laborers to take the places of the strikers, and the machinery worked smoothly again. Whole colonies of American citizens have been swept away from their places of labor in this manner. Who was it that originated a bill repealing this law? It originated in a Democratic House of Representatives. Not only was the law allowing the importation of contract laborers repealed, but an amendment was made afterwards, with the approval of President Cleveland, which made the vessel bringing them to this country liable for the expense of transporting them back, and by a clause I offered, which was adopted, if it failed to do so, prevented it from entering in or clearing from our ports. This President Cleveland made effective by his approval. I leave this House to determine which has manifested the greatest affection and which has bestowed the greatest blessing upon the laboring man in this case, the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania or the President whose message he criticises.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to show that I do not distort the facts of the case, I send to the Clerk's desk also to be read the testimony of laboring men, taken before Senator Blair's investigating committee, in my distinguished friend's State, showing the oppression that grew out of the act which has been read.

John Murray, of Shawnee (Ohio) Miners' Association:

"Our men are deeply interested in the bill against the importation of labor, and we expect Congress to do something to remedy the evil. There were seven hundred foreigners and seven hundred colored men brought to my district during a recent strike."

Fred Turner, of Philadelphia, Pa., secretary of the Knights of Labor, said:

"It is the universal sentiment that the bill of Mr. Foran should be passed. The importation of foreign workmen is getting as bad as that of the Chinese. We have not the slightest objection to their voluntary coming. The African slave was better off than are these people under some of these contracts. The slave had some one to look after his welfare: these people have not. We present a petition to the committee containing 35,000 names of persons who pray for relief by the passage of a bill to remedy this matter."

There is another gentleman whom I wish to quote to show the importance of tariff reduction. At a time when there was not one tithe the necessity or demand for tariff reduction that there is to-day, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Randall] made a speech, in the Forty-seventh Congress, in which he used the following language, and made use of the following strong arguments in favor of a reduction in taxation; this, too, when we had outstanding, subject to the call of the Government, over \$400,000,000 of bonds, and when the surplus was less than now:

It is equally true that excessive taxation, even when it is successful in securing revenue, is ultimately destructive of the sources of labor from which it is drawn, while at the same time it engenders extravagance, corruption, and decay. For when the Government sets the example of extravagance, it is soon followed in every walk of life, and one does not need to be a prophet to foretell the general ruin which must inevitably result. Frugality and economy never destroyed any government, while they have built up the most powerful empires the world has ever witnessed.

And again in the same speech he says:

The existing overflowing Treasury brings a demand for reduction of the tariff and internal-revenue taxes. In my opinion, in such a condition of our finances, reduction of taxation should at once begin. Unnecessary taxation is injurious to the interests of the people in many directions. Government has no justification for the collection of burdensome taxes in excess of the sum requisite for the support of its proper administration. What have we seen in this Congress? The excess of our resources has induced the presentation of every conceivable scheme to deplete the Treasury, and our expenditures, unless checked in time, will reach enormous proportions and bring back again, as prior to 1874, a saturnalia of extravagance and disgrace.

Your committee have done the very things that it was stated then were necessary to be done. They have prepared a bill for the reduction of internal-revenue and tariff taxes. Every bond that was subject to the call of the Government when that speech was made has been paid. Every dollar of indebtedness which can be discharged without the payment of a high premium has been extinguished; vast accumulations have been piled up in the Treasury until its vaults are fairly bursting with money which ought to be in the channels of trade, till there is about \$150,000,000 where there was only a small surplus. This House stands ready to make good the words which he used on that occasion. It is ready to give the relief which he said the people were entitled to receive. We are ready and willing to remove the temptation to corrupt government which he said was always found in a plethoric Treasury. We are ready to aid him in insuring to the people that "frugality and economy" which he said never "destroyed any government," and to prevent that "saturnalia of extravagance and disgrace" which he said characterized the period just anterior to 1874.

CONSUMER PAYS TARIFF TAXES.

It is insisted by some protectionists that the foreign manufacturer pays the taxes which are collected from imports. A greater fallacy was never attempted to be palmed off on the people. When goods reach the custom-house the importer pays the tariff dues; he then sells to the retail dealer for the original cost, the insurance, tariffs, and his commissions added. Upon all of these the retail dealer adds a per cent. to pay him for dealing in the goods, and with this per cent. added upon the tariff cost he sells to the consumer, who in the end pays every dollar, both of the original cost, insurance, tariffs, and the profits of the two dealers through whose hands they pass. The tariff duties, therefore, increase by so much the price at which the consumer buys them. There would be more comfort in the transaction if the Government got the benefit of all the costs thus added. But it is estimated that for every dollar paid into the Treasury on imported goods there is paid to the manufacturers of this country five; so that the tariff taxation costs not only what is paid into the custom-house, but the incidental increase of expense upon all, or a greater part, of the dutiable goods made and consumed in the United States.

The lowest estimate that can possibly be placed upon this increased cost of commodities to the people is hundreds of millions of dollars. Under what clause of the Constitution can a tax be legally

placed upon the people for any other purpose than the necessities of government? I would also be exceedingly gratified to have any man, be he constitutional lawyer or not, explain where is the justice in requiring one man to contribute a tax to make another man's vocation pay.

The following table will show what the increased cost added to these classes of articles of domestic manufacture alone has been by reason of the high tariff in one year:

Articles.	Imports, 1887.	Duties.	Domestic manufactures.	Cost added by tariff
Iron	\$50,618,985	\$20,713,233	\$296,557,685	\$85,000,000
Cotton.....	29,150,058	11,710,719	192,090,110	55,000,000
Wool.....	44,235,243	29,729,717	267,252,913	107,000,000
Total cost added by tariff.....				247,000,000

* * * * * * * * *

DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN SHIPPING.

There is another thing to which I wish to call attention in passing to show the calamitous results which have followed this repressive policy. Under the rule of this Government before we attempted to exclude everything from our markets and forced the people to buy in the dearest markets, we had commerce carried on in American ships with all the nations of the earth. The American seaman was found in every port, the American vessel breasted the waves of all waters, and the American flag floated over the mastheads of hundreds of ships and over thousands of seamen. We had conquered the lands and triumphed on the sea, and asked no people on earth to carry our commerce for us; but instead were engaged in successful rivalry, carrying on commerce between the other nations of the world. Glory, honor, and empire were ours. But what is the situation to-day? The Secretary of the Treasury has stated it tersely in the following passage taken from his report:

Thus it will be seen that our foreign commerce, carried in vessels of the United States, measured by its value, has steadily declined from 75 per cent. in 1856 to less than 14 per cent. in 1887. Even of this small percentage less than one-half was carried in steam-vessels bearing our flag.

A citizen of the United States may buy a foreign-built vessel in a foreign port; he may put the United States flag upon it and trade with all the countries of the world except his own. Our Government will protect him with all its power in such trade; but if he brings his ship with our flag upon it to one of our ports, our Government will confiscate it or impose prohibitory duties.

He may, however, put the flag of any other country on that same ship and bring it to his home without molestation by our Government; it is then protected by the power of a foreign country. It is difficult to understand why it would not be well to so change our navigation laws as to allow foreign-built ships owned by our citizens to come and go between this and other countries while bearing the flag of the country of their owners.

We have absolutely driven our carrying trade from our own people. Pretending to protect, we have done nothing but destroy; pretending to assist, we have only crushed our seafaring industry; pretending to be a friend of the American merchant marine, we have been its worst and deadliest enemy, and to-day we carry but 13 per cent. of our foreign commerce and pay millions to others to do that work for us; and yet gentlemen come here and propose to undo this work by subsidies out of the people's Treasury.

So extraordinary are our laws that if a citizen of this Government buys a ship abroad and puts the flag of his own country on it and comes into an American port his ship is seized by the United States authorities.

The copper, the iron, the steel, and other materials which enter into the construction of a ship bear a duty so high we cannot build, and yet gentlemen complain that ship-building in this country costs more than it does in foreign countries, and a cry comes up of the decay of our merchant marine while you refuse to give any remedy.

Sad, sad to the patriotic heart is the reflection that we have so degenerated in our foreign carrying trade that when the American citizen goes to many of the ports of the world accredited as consul and desires once more to see the flag of his native land, he looks not out on the broad blue ocean! Alas, it is not there! He must turn sorrowfully into his own room, delve down into the bottom of his own trunk, and get out the Stars and Stripes he carried with him.

They propose to counteract the vicious and constricting policy which has been followed for so many years by levying taxes upon those who live inland to make the vocations of those who are engaged in the carrying trade pay. Commerce cannot be restored in that way. It is futile to attempt it. So long as the American citizen can not fly the American flag on any vessel except those built in our ports—and has to pay 30 per cent. more to build his vessel than does the citizen of any other country—so long will we be laboring under a disadvantage which subsidy is inadequate to remedy. [Applause.]

LABOR.

Under what specious plea have we robbed the people, laborers and all? Under the pretense that it is for the benefit of the laboring men. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mills] in the opening of this discussion made some illustrations, and quoted some statistics, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelly] never answered, and which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows] I predict, will not attempt to answer.

We only have to make a few comparisons to show the utter fallacy of the claim of the protectionists that the high duties now existing were imposed or are kept for the benefit of the laboring man. I give the following table, compiled by Mr. Seaton, superintendent, from the Tenth Census, showing the value of various manufactured products in 1880 and the per cent. that the labor cost bears to the whole cost. I have also added for convenience the present and proposed tariff rates, from which it will be seen that in no instance does the committee propose on these articles a duty less than the per cent. of labor cost that is contained in them.

Table, compiled from Tenth Census, showing value of various manufactured products, per cent. of labor cost, rate of duty existing and proposed.

Industries.	Value of product.	Labor.	Percentage of labor.	Present tariff.	Proposed rate.
				<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Carpets	\$31,792,802	\$6,835,218	21.5	47	30
Cotton goods	210,950,383	45,614,419	21.6	50	40
Bolts, nuts, etc.	10,073,330	1,981,300	19.7	59	35
Nails and spikes.....	5,629,240	1,255,171	22.3	43	34
Iron pipe, wrought.....	13,292,162	1,788,258	13.5	70	35
Oil, castor.....	653,900	44,714	6.8	194	97
Oil, linseed.....	15,393,812	681,677	4.4	54	21
Screws	2,184,532	456,542	20.9	50	35
Wool hats.....	8,516,569	1,893,215	22.2	54	40
Woolen goods.....	160,006,721	25,896,392	16.1	70	40
Worsted goods.....	33,549,942	5,683,027	16.9	68	40

It will thus be seen that while the labor in carpets, leaving off fractions, is 21 per cent. of the cost, the tariff is 47 per cent. In cotton goods the labor is the same and the tariff 50 per cent. In wrought-iron pipe, labor is 13 per cent. and the tariff 70 per cent. In castor-oil, labor 6 per cent. and the tariff 194 per cent. In wool hats, the labor is 22 per cent. and the tariff 54 per cent. In woolen goods, labor is 16 per cent. and the tariff 70 per cent. In worsted goods, labor is 16 per cent. and the tariff 68 per cent. I do not

blame manufacturers and capitalists for wanting to form a partnership with the laboring man when such a small per cent. of all the cost is labor when compared with the rate of duty imposed.

COMPLAINTS OF THE MINORITY.

The gentlemen who signed the minority report complain of the manner in which the bill under consideration was prepared. I hazard nothing in saying that if their wishes in this regard had been complied with, and an attempt made to do all the work in full committee at odd times, when the House was not in session, June would have reached us without any bill before this House; for it will be remembered that when a request was made for the committee to sit during the sessions of the House it was opposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. What right have they to complain? The question is not how, when, or where the bill was prepared, but what is the bill? Is it good or bad? They are in no attitude to complain in any event, because it is a well-known fact that the very gentlemen who signed the minority report in 1883 railroaded through Congress a bill which was not only never prepared by the Ways and Means Committee of the House, as is contemplated by the Constitution, but was never read in the House of Representatives. The tariff law which we now seek to amend thus became a law without the members of Congress ever having heard or read it. Hence I say they are in no attitude to criticise anybody for any method adopted in the framing of a tariff bill.

INCONSISTENCIES OF PRESENT LAW.

The minority complain at what they are pleased to call the inconsistencies in the bill. Let those inconsistencies be what they may, they are not a tenth nor a hundredth part of those found under the present law, which these gentlemen helped to force upon the country. Let us take a few illustrations. Woolen yarns bear a duty of 69 per cent.; the higher-priced cloths of wool bear a duty of only 68 per cent., the cheaper dress goods a duty of 67 per cent., and the higher 59 per cent., while the ready-made clothing into which the cloths are made bears a duty of only 54 per cent. Take wool; let it be scoured, carded, spun, woven, and made into cloth by the carding process, and it bears a duty ranging from 68 to 89 per cent. But take the same wool, wash it, or scour it as you did before, and comb it, so that when spun and woven it is worsted cloth, and it bears a less rate of duty than is imposed on woollens. Whoever saw

a more glaring inconsistency in a tariff bill than this? Nor is this confined to woolen goods. Look to cotton goods. Colored tarlatan has a duty of 250 per cent., while ruchings, that are made therefrom, bear a duty of only 35 per cent. Come down to the metal schedule. Hoop-iron not thinner than No. 20 bears a duty of 47 per cent., while cotton-ties, made of this same hoop-iron, bear a duty of only 35 per cent. Pig-iron bears a duty of \$6.72 per ton, while die-blocks, etc., made of pig-iron, bear a duty of only \$6.04 per ton. In this way, and by this kind of "tinkering," almost every worsted establishment in the country claims to have been on the verge of bankruptcy since 1883, when the iniquitous tariff under which we are now living was adopted.

If these gentlemen had attempted to put a premium upon the closing up of establishments on this side of the waters and opening them on the other, they could not have been more effectual than they have been by this inconsistent, incongruous tariff which we are now trying to amend; and yet they complain that there is not consistency in the bill which we present. There is another fault to be found with the present tariff law which we have striven to remedy by the bill which we present for your adoption. In almost every schedule of the present law it will be observed that the coarser the goods and the more likely they are to be worn or used by those in the humbler walks of life the higher the rate of duty fixed upon them; and the converse, of course, follows, that the more luxuriant the article the lower the rate of duty. We have attempted in the tariff which we present for your adoption to so frame it that the tax would bear most heavily upon luxuries and those things without which the people can live, rather than upon the necessities of life. Hence we have reduced the tariff on the metal schedule, but have not lowered it on jewelry; we have reduced it on woolen goods, and have not lowered it on silks; and we have reduced it on sugar and taken it off of salt, but have not made one farthing of reduction on liquors, wines, etc.

There is an objection to our economic training of the day that may be justly urged. That is, the tendency to inculcate in the people a desire for paternal government. We are striving to teach our people concerning tariffs and almost everything else that they cannot prosper in their business pursuits without they are fortified by United States statutes; we are trying to inculcate in them the belief that upon Congress depends the amount of their wages, the number of hours which they shall labor and their prosperity or adversity in their industrial pursuits. There never yet was an assemblage of lawmakers wise enough to devise laws which should

control and regulate these things with perfect satisfaction to all. They must be left to their own best regulation. They are controlled best when they are controlled least. What is the result of this teaching? When you teach the people to look to government to do this you teach them to look for that in which they must inevitably be disappointed; and when the disappointment comes, believing that government is to blame for all the calamities that overtake them, they first become dissatisfied with it, then get to be lukewarm toward it, and may finally hate it.

Woe will betide the day when the laboring people of the United States come to believe that Congress, and it alone, can give them prosperity or adversity in their industrial pursuits. It is better to follow the old doctrine of the fathers, to protect the citizen in his life, his liberty, and his pursuit of happiness, and leave him to do the balance unhampered by legislative restraint and undeluded by demagogic flattery and folly. I now and then am most profoundly disgusted by hearing some man, while sawing the air with his hands and splitting the ears of the groundlings with his tongue, proclaim that the American citizen cannot stand the least competition with the men of other countries. I am an American born, an American by instinct, an American in all my affections, and I am never going to do the people of the United States the injustice to suppose that God ever created a race of human beings on this earth who can successfully put down the American citizen in his race for supremacy in all that is right. [Applause.] I do not believe it now; I never will believe it until I shall have seen it tried and demonstrated that I am wrong; and he does himself injustice, he does his sires injustice and his sons injustice, who holds to the doctrine that we are a generation of pygmies to be overridden by other people without we have Congressional legislation to aid us.

Protectionists are peculiarly unfortunate in the different arguments to which they resort to accomplish the same end. With seemingly bland simplicity, they tell the workman that he wants protection to give him higher wages. They turn round and in the same breath tell the citizen who pays these taxes that he wants protection for the purpose of giving him cheaper clothes; for, they say, "home competition inevitably does this." They tell the manufacturer he wants it to give him greater profits. How the same law is going to give cheaper clothes to the poor man, higher wages to the laboring man, and greater profit to the manufacturer they do not deign to show. But it is not for the laboring man that this claim is really made; it is not for the man who pays the taxes that it is made; but it is corporate capital disguised as the "friend of the

laboring man and the taxpayer" that is making this argument. It will not be denied by any that we have the most fruitful and fertile soil, combined with the most genial climate in the world. We have, taken as a class, the most industrious people and the highest inventive genius in the world. There is no other country on the earth that takes so few of its young men from the industrial callings to go into the military and naval service as does ours. These things being so, is the day not at hand or fast approaching when all of this energy, this inventive genius, this freedom to work in industrial pursuits, will not be satisfied or prosperous in simply making what it can eat and wear?

EXTEND OUR MARKETS.

We must have other and broader markets. I say to-day to those living on the coasts that to them will first come the calamities of a restricted market. In the early history of the country our large cities were stretched along the coast, and those in the interior labored under great disadvantages. But railroads have changed our commerce, and just inside of this line of border cities have sprung up other cities which are as prosperous and promising as those on the seacoast. They are rapidly taking the trade from the seacoast, and those who live upon the outskirts will soon find their only refuge from decay will be upon the broad ocean, and there they will have to turn. They cannot always beat down their neighbors in their own markets. They have to get out in the world or go down in the conflict. The time will come when New England will not be able to buy cotton in the South, manufacture it 1,200 miles away, pay two transportations, and sell it in competition with mills running beside the cotton-fields.

Take my own State as an illustration. We are far in the interior. Originally we were a fine market for the products of Pennsylvania and the Eastern manufactures, but to-day we are doing much of our own manufacturing. Instead of going abroad for commodities we are sending them abroad. We are sending our marble from ocean to ocean; we are shipping our coke hundreds of miles; our iron, carried through Pittsburgh, is being sold as far east as Boston, and the generation is now here that will behold the auctioneer from Alabama and Tennessee standing upon the custom-house steps of the city of Pittsburgh auctioning off pig-iron in sight of furnaces from which the smoke is no longer curling. But the wheels of industry there will not be stopped thereby, but can be employed converting this pig into new forms.

I hold in my hand a piece of steel made by the Henderson process at Birmingham, Ala., out of our Southern iron, high in phosphorus, at a cost, as the president of the works tells me, of \$18 a ton. American pluck, energy, and inventive genius again triumphant!

I regretted to hear the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania speak of the fact we have not further developed in the South. I do not recur to the past for any purpose, except for the lesson of wisdom which it teaches. God forbid that in my heart there should be found a corner dark enough to wish misfortune to any quarter of this grand country. [Applause.] I am for every foot of it, wherever that glorious flag floats [pointing to the flag over the Speaker's desk] or our eagle soars. [Prolonged applause.] In contemplating what has already been done there, I am not surprised that we have done so little, but I am astonished we have done so much. When the war closed we had eleven millions of people in the South. And of the eleven millions, the combined wealth of six millions of them above indebtedness would not have bought one suit of clothes. To-day we stand triumphant over misfortune. I recur to this not to criticise any, but to rejoice with all. [Applause.]

On the gloomy outlook for

NEW ENGLAND MANUFACTURES.

I quote from a gentleman who lives in New England, a very distinguished diplomat under the last administration—I mean the Hon. James Russell Lowell. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] He was a diplomat and the representative of your administration accredited to the Court of St. James. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. Benedict Arnold was a major-general in the Continental Army. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. My friend from Pennsylvania has shown by his interruption and speech that he lives in the past and the past only.

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; and you will, too, when you get to be as old as I am. [Applause.]

Mr. McMILLIN. My sincere hope is that the gentleman's years may be lengthened out for many summers yet. [Applause.]

I send to the Clerk's desk to be read an extract from a speech made in New York on the 13th instant by Mr. Lowell, whose name has aroused so much ire on the other side of the Chamber.

The Clerk read as follows:

All that reasonable men contend for now is the reduction of the tariff in

such a way as shall be least hurtful to existing interests, most helpful to the consumer, and, above all, as shall practically test the question whether we are better off when we get our raw material at the lowest possible prices. I think the advocates of protection have been unwise, and are beginning to see that they are unwise in shifting the ground of debate. They have set many people to asking whether robbing Peter to pay Paul is a method equally economical for both parties, and whether the bad policy of it be not all the more flagrant in proportion as the Peters are many and the Pauls few? Whether the Pauls of every variety be not inevitably forced into an alliance offensive and defensive against the Peters? Whether if we are taxed for the payment of a bounty to the owner of a silver mine we should not be equally taxed to make a present to the owner of wheat fields, cotton fields, tobacco fields, which are the most productive gold mines of this country? Whether the case of protection is not like that of armored ships, requiring ever thicker plating as the artillery of competition is perfected?

I confess I cannot take a cheerful view of the future of that New England I love so well, when her leading industries shall be gradually drawn to the South, as they infallibly will be, by the great cheapness of labor there. It is not pleasant to hear that called the American system which has succeeded in abolishing our foreign commerce. It is even less pleasant to hear it advocated as being for the interest of the laborer by men who imported cheap labor till it was forbidden by law. That protection has been the cause of our material prosperity is refuted by the passage I have quoted from Burke.

* * * * *

Of the surplus in the Treasury I will only say that it has already shown itself to be an incitement to every possible variety of wasteful expenditure, and, therefore, of demoralizing jobbery, and that it has again revived that theory of grandmotherly government which is most hostile to the genius of our institutions, and which soonest saps the energy and corrodes the morals of the people.

Mr. McMILLIN. Lest I should forget it let me now answer another of the positions taken, upon which the gentleman from Pennsylvania laid great stress in his speech. It will be remembered that he stated that by indirection the committee had placed iron ore and coal on the free-list. That is absolutely without any just foundation. It was not the purpose of the committee to do it, it did not attempt to do it, and has not done it.

This the committee has left untouched.

Under another section the following is found, which was made free by us:

Mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, it will be remembered that those things which we did not touch in that law are left as the law now provides. That is the basis

on which the bill is framed and upon which we expect it to be sustained.

Mr. BAYNE, of Pennsylvania. But what do you make of the proposition on page 59, where it provides:

And all laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the other requirements and provisions of this act are also hereby repealed.

Mr. McMILLIN. My friend will remember we only affect those things named in the bill, and the provision relating to iron-ore is not named—therefore is not affected by the bill, therefore not inconsistent with the bill, and therefore not repealed by the clause he cites.

Why, my friend will bear witness that we do not touch the duty on jewelry, for instance, in this bill; and yet it would not be claimed that that provision he has cited would have reference to jewelry and put it on the free-list. We do not touch wines or liquors, and they cannot be claimed to be on the free-list. We do not touch the silk schedules, and yet they are left right where they were. And so I might go on through the bill. Many luxuries we have not lowered, and they remain as in the existing law, notwithstanding the repealing clause read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE]. This is an amendment to existing law, and therefore the classification in the existing law remains unless specifically amended or altered by this bill.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. McMILLIN. I cannot trespass upon the time of the House much longer. I have now spoken nearly two hours, and although the House has been very kind to me I must not abuse its favor. More than \$10,000 of surplus has gone into the Treasury while I have been speaking, to be locked up, and we must hasten on.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I am sorry. I hope \$10,000 more will go. I always like to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLIN. I thank my friend for his compliment.

TRUSTS AND POOLS.

Let that deluded statesman who believes that the high duties which we have thrown around our country can ever insure to the people low prices for commodities behold the situation to-day. For years we have had these halls ringing with statements that by and by home competition would give us the lowest possible prices. The welkin has been made to ring with this declaration, iterated and reiterated, until even those who first proclaimed it have almost

gotten to believe it. But look at our unfortunate situation and let this delusion be dispelled. While the Government has thrown up its tariff walls without, monopolists have joined hands within for the purpose of putting up prices and plundering the people through the devices known as trusts, pools, and combines.

MR. FORAN, of Ohio. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him how under this bill it is possible to prevent the formation of trusts either in this or in other countries?

MR. McMILLIN. I am glad my friend asked that question. It is easy of elucidation. You cannot absolutely prevent the formation of the trusts, but you make it vastly more difficult for them to control as you extend the area over which they are to operate.

MR. FORAN. Another question. Is it not true that the only remedy for trusts is competition?

MR. McMILLIN. Why, competition does not amount to a straw when they get together and determine with each other that they will not compete, and that they will close up every new establishment that starts and refuses to join the trust.

MR. Chairman, we have the steel-rail trust, which cost the people of this country last year millions of dollars. It is not a trust to increase production, but to restrict it; it is not a trust to give cheaper commodities to the people, but to put bigger profits into the pockets of the monopolists. It has closed furnaces that were successfully running; it has, aided by the tariff, increased by more than \$1,000 the cost of every mile of railroad built in the United States for the last five years; it has thrown men out of employment and broken up the means of living of thousands of workingmen. Why, even the existence of this trust has been denied; but listen to this quotation from the Bulletin of the American Iron and Steel Association, a paper printed in the interests of the iron and steel producers of the United States, and at their cost.

Under the head "American iron market for steel rails" we find the following:

STEEL RAILS.

One of the makers reports sales during the week aggregating 6,000 tons. Outside of this no transactions whatever are reported, and the market is extremely dull both East and West. The board of control has decided upon an increase in the allotment of 200,000 tons, which will relieve the pressure on some of the Eastern mills.

It would seem from this very business-like statement that the "board of control" is not misnamed, and absolutely controls the

output of steel rails in this country. It determines when it shall be increased and when restricted, being careful only to maintain prices up to the cost of foreign goods with the duty added.

Have the gentlemen of the minority proposed anything better? Have they framed a bill to be adopted in lieu of ours? Have they told the House and the country what remedy they recommend for the evils which all admit to be upon us? No, sir. They are mute as to a remedy; they are dumb as to relief.

I tell them that policy will never win with a tax-ridden, a monopolily-oppressed people, a people weighed down by trusts, pools, and combines. This is not a do-nothing occasion; ours not a do-nothing people. I have no fear concerning the ultimate result of this conflict between the people and the "pool." I have no fear as to the outcome in the contest between the country and the combine. I have no apprehension as to who will be victor in the battle about to be waged between legitimate taxation and that oppressive taxation which is invoked to aid trusts and make pooling profitable. The people have waited long and patiently. But at last they are aroused. Their voice comes thundering through these halls demanding reduction of taxes. "Justice has had to travel with a leaden heel, but is ready to strike with an iron hand." The procession for the relief of the tax-payer is moving. There are but two places about this procession—one after it, the other under it. Seek to-day, sirs, whether you prefer to follow and aid it, or go down under it and be crushed by it. [Prolonged applause.]

HON. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, JR.,

OF OHIO.

(Republican Side.)

Our country is in an anomalous situation. There is nothing resembling it anywhere else in the world. While we are seeking to find objects to relieve from taxation, in order that we may relieve an overflowing Treasury, other nations are engaged in exploring the field of human production to find new objects of taxation to supply their insufficient revenues. In considering the situation that thus confronts us, and the bill that is presented here as intended to relieve it, it is well that we should understand at the beginning the things upon which all are agreed.

They are, first, that we are collecting more money than is required for the current needs of the Government; and second, that the excess, whatever it may be, beyond the wants of the Government should be left with the people. Our contention, therefore, is upon the manner of the reduction and not upon the reduction itself; not that no reduction shall or ought to be made, but how and upon what principle can it best be accomplished. We agree, further, that the tax upon tobacco shall be removed and thus leave with the people \$30,000,000 which they annually pay upon this domestic product. Were we men of business, governed by the principles which guide practical men of affairs, this burden would have been and could have been removed any time within the past two years, and if removed two years ago no surplus would now vex the Administration or alarm the business of the country. In passing, it is suitable that I should say that within the period named no hinderance from this side of the House would have been interposed to the abolition of this tax.

It is also suitable that I should say, for the sake of the truth of history, that gentlemen on this side and gentlemen on the other side of the House repeatedly made efforts during the last Congress to secure recognition for the purpose of offering a bill to abolish this

tax, which request was refused by the presiding officer of the House, and refused, too, when every intelligent representative on this floor knew that if an opportunity was given to vote upon a bill for the abolition of that tax it would have received not simply a majority, but the vote of fully two-thirds of the House. I repeat that if that had been done, if the House as then organized had given to the representatives of the people an opportunity to vote upon a simple proposition to reduce taxation, no immediate surplus would be now in the Treasury to interrupt and disturb the business of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But this tax was not abolished, and if done now still leaves about forty millions of revenue collected in excess of the public necessity. How can this amount be remitted with the least disturbance to the business and employments of the people ?

This is the real, the practical question. At this point parties and individuals differ, and herein the two lines of political thought which have prevailed from the formation of the Government are clearly manifested, and present for the consideration and the ultimate judgment of the people the division between the Republican and Democratic parties upon a purely economic question. I cannot forbear, in this connection, to congratulate the country that upon this question our fellow-citizens of all sections and all nationalities, without regard to past party affiliations, unbiased by prejudice, and uninfluenced by passion, can divide. Here is presented an issue which leaves the past behind and looks only to the present and the future, an issue without a tinge or touch of sectionalism, which awakens none of the bitter memories of former discord or divisions, which appeals neither to race nor geographical lines, which knows no North, or South, or East, or West, but brings all within its sweep and contemplation, each dividing upon what each may honestly regard for the best interests and highest welfare of all; an issue which we can consider and discuss calmly and deliberately, having only in view the future of the individual citizen and the highest and best destiny of the Republic. In this spirit I welcome the issue so sharply, and I may say boldly, made by the President in his annual message and now further made by the bill under debate, and approach its consideration with the single purpose to reach if possible a conclusion which shall bring to the country and the whole country, with whose interests we are temporarily intrusted, the widest benefits and the most lasting good. [Applause.]

It will be freely confessed by our political opponents that this bill is but the beginning of a tariff policy marked out by the President, and is a partial response only to his message, to be followed up with

additional legislation until our system of taxation shall be brought back to the ancient landmarks of the Democratic party, to a purely revenue basis; that is, that the tariff or duty put upon foreign importations shall hereafter look to revenue and revenue only, and discard all other considerations.

WHAT IS REVENUE TARIFF?

This brings us face to face, therefore, with the two opposing systems, that of a revenue as distinguished from a protective tariff, and upon their respective merits they must stand or fall. Now, what are they? First, what is a revenue tariff? Upon what principle does it rest? It is a tariff or tax placed upon such articles of foreign production imported here as will produce the largest revenue with the smallest tax; or, as Robert J. Walker, late Secretary of the Treasury and author of the tariff of 1846, from whom the advocates of the measure draw their inspiration, put it:

The only true maxim is that which experience demonstrates will bring in each case the largest revenue at the lowest rate of duty, and that no duty be imposed upon any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue. The revenue (said Mr. Walker), from *ad valorem* duties last year (1845) exceeded that realized from specific duties, although the average of the *ad valorem* duties was only 23.57 per cent. and the average of the specific duties 41.30 per cent., presenting another strong proof that the lower duties increase the revenue.

To secure larger revenue from lower duties necessitates largely increased importations, and if these compete with domestic products the latter must be diminished or find other and distant and I may say impossible markets or get out of the way altogether. A genuine revenue tariff imposes no tax upon foreign importations the like of which are produced at home, or, if produced at home, in quantities not capable of supplying the home consumption, in which case it may be truthfully said the tax is added to the foreign cost and is paid by the consumer.

A revenue tariff seeks out those articles whose domestic production cannot supply, or only inadequately supply, and which the wants of our people demand, and imposes the duty upon them, and permits as far as possible the competing foreign product to be imported free of duty. This principle is made conspicuous in the bill under consideration; for example, wool, a competing foreign product, which our own flock-masters can fully supply for domestic wants, is put upon the free-list, while sugar, with a home product of only one-eleventh of the home consumption, is left dutiable,

Any tax levied upon a foreign product which is a necessity to our people, and which we cannot fully supply, will produce revenue in amount only measured by our necessities and ability to buy. In a word, foreign productions not competing with home productions are the proper subjects for taxation under a revenue tariff, and in case these do not furnish the requisite revenue a low duty is put upon the foreign product competing with the domestic one—low enough to encourage and stimulate importations, and low enough to break down eventually domestic competition. For example, the duty proposed under this bill upon cotton bagging will extinguish the industry here, and under its provision we would import all of that product from Calcutta and Dundee. A large revenue would come from this source, because the foreign would take the place of the domestic production. This duty is a revenue one, and gives no protection whatever to the home producer. If it did it would not be a revenue tariff. As the Cobden school of political science puts it, "The moment it is made clear that a tax is a benefit to home producers, then the free-trade dogma condemns it. The test is simple and easy of application. Free-trade or a revenue tariff does not allow any import duties being imposed on such articles as are likewise produced at home." Or if produced at home a revenue tariff would soon destroy their production.

WHAT IS A PROTECTIVE TARIFF?

What is a protective tariff? It is a tariff upon foreign imports so adjusted as to secure the necessary revenue, and judiciously imposed upon those foreign products the like of which are produced at home or the like of which we are capable of producing at home. [Applause.] It imposes the duty upon the competing foreign product; it makes it bear the burden or duty, and, as far as possible, luxuries only excepted, permits the non-competing foreign product to come in free of duty. Articles of common use, comfort, and necessity which we cannot produce here it sends to the people untaxed and free from custom-house exactions. [Applause.] Tea, coffee, spices, and drugs are such articles, and under our system are upon the free-list. It says to our foreign competitor, if you want to bring your merchandise here, your farm products here, your coal and iron ore, your wool, your salt, your pottery, your glass, your cottons and woollens, and sell alongside of our producers in our markets, we will make your product bear a duty; in effect, pay for the privilege of doing it. [Applause on the Republican side.] Our kind of a tariff makes the competing foreign article carry the burden, draw the load, supply

the revenue; and in performing this essential office it encourages at the same time our own industries and protects our own people in their chosen employments. [Applause.] That is the mission and purpose of a protective tariff. That is what we mean to maintain, and any measure which will destroy it we shall firmly resist, and if beaten on this floor we will appeal from your decision to the people, before whom parties and policies must at last be tried. [Applause.] We have free trade among ourselves throughout thirty-eight States and the Territories and among sixty millions of people. Absolute freedom of exchange within our own borders and among our own citizens is the law of the Republic. Reasonable taxation and restraint upon those without is the dictate of enlightened patriotism and the doctrine of the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Free trade in the United States is founded upon a community of equalities and reciprocities. It is like the unrestrained freedom and reciprocal relations and obligations of a family. Here we are one country, one language, one allegiance, one standard of citizenship, one flag, one Constitution, one nation, one destiny. It is otherwise with foreign nations, each a separate organism, a distinct and independent political society organized for its own, to protect its own, and work out its own destiny. We deny to those foreign nations free trade with us upon equal terms with our own producers. [Applause.] The foreign producer has no right or claim to equality with our own. He is not amenable to our laws. There are resting upon him none of the obligations of citizenship. He pays no taxes. He performs no civil duties; is subject to no demands for military service. He is exempt from State, county, and municipal obligations. He contributes nothing to the support, the progress, and glory of the nation. Why should he enjoy unrestrained equal privileges and profits in our markets with our producers, our labor, and our tax-payers? Let the gentleman who follows me answer. [Applause.] We put a burden upon his productions, we discriminate against his merchandise, because he is alien to us and our interests, and we do it to protect our own, defend our own, preserve our own, who are always with us in adversity and prosperity, in sympathy and purpose, and, if necessary, in sacrifice. [Applause.] That is the principle which governs us. I submit it is a patriotic and righteous one. In our own country, each citizen competing with the other in free and unresentful rivalry, while with the rest of the world all are united and together in resisting outside competition as we would foreign interference.

Free foreign trade admits the foreigner to equal privileges with

our own citizens. It invites the product of foreign cheap labor to this market in competition with the domestic product, representing higher and better paid labor. It results in giving our money, our manufactures, and our markets to other nations, to the injury of our labor, our tradespeople, and our farmers. Protection keeps money, markets, and manufactures at home for the benefit of our own people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is scarcely worth while to more than state the proposition that taxation upon a foreign competing product is more easily paid and less burdensome than taxation upon the non-competing product. In the latter it is always added to the foreign cost, and therefore paid by the consumer, while in the former, where the duty is upon the competing product, it is largely paid in the form of diminished profits to the foreign producer. [Applause.] It would be burdensome beyond endurance to collect our taxes from the products, professions, and labor of our own people.

THE BILL WILL NOT REDUCE THE REVENUE.

Now, this is a bill ostensibly to reduce the revenue. It will not do it. Take from this bill its internal-revenue features, its reduction of twenty-four and a half million dollars from tobacco and from special licenses to dealers in spirits and tobacco, eliminate these from the bill and you will not secure a dollar of reduction to the Treasury under its operation. Your \$27,000,000 of proposed reduction by the free-list will be more than offset by the increased revenues which shall come from your lower duties; and I venture the prediction here to-day that if this bill should become a law, at the end of the fiscal year 1889 the dutiable list under it will carry more money into the Treasury than is carried into the Treasury under the present law, because with every reduction of duties upon foreign imports you stimulate and increase foreign importations; and to the extent that you increase foreign importation, to that extent you increase the revenue.

THE INCONSISTENCIES OF THE BILL.

There is another singular thing in connection with this bill, and I have nowhere seen attention called to it. Now I do not intend to examine the bill item by item. The minority of the Committee on Ways and Means (whose views, on behalf of my political associates I presented) went sufficiently over the bill in detail. But there are a few striking things in the bill which the country ought to understand. No one would have supposed from hearing this discussion

but that the bill reduced duties all along the line. You would never have suspected, had you listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mills], or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bynum], or other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, that this bill increased duties, would you? How many men on the other side of the House know what is in this bill to-day? I would like to poll them. [Laughter.]

Now, here is a single item, steel billets. The present duty on steel billets is 45 per cent. ad valorem. In this bill it is increased to \$11 per ton, which is equivalent to 68.33 per cent.—an advance of 45 per cent. Do you know what is made out of these steel billets? Wire fencing, which incloses the great fields of the West; and the raw material is increased 45 per cent. by this bill; and if the principle of the gentlemen who advocate the bill be true, that the duty is added to the cost, every pound of wire fencing that goes to the West will be increased from one-quarter to one-half a cent a pound; all this under a Democratic bill. What else is made out of steel billets? Nails, which everybody uses, which enter into the every-day uses of the people. The duty upon nails is reduced 25 per cent., and the raw material is increased 45 per cent. [Laughter.] As a friend near me suggests, when one end goes up the other goes down; and the latter, I trust, will be the fate of this bill. [Laughter.]

Why, the duty on wire fencing is only 45 per cent. ad valorem; yet the billet from which wire fencing is made must pay in this bill 63 per cent. Here [illustrating] is a piece of wire rod drawn from these steel billets, and which finally goes into fencing. That is dutiable at 45 per cent. under this bill; and the steel from which it is made is dutiable at 63 per cent. What do you think of "raw material for manufactures"? [Laughter.] No account is here taken of the labor required to draw the rods.

But that is not all which is remarkable about this bill, this great bill which is based upon principle, it is said, which the President stands behind and beneath, and which he insists shall be passed, whether or no, in this House, and for the passage of which he is dispensing official favors; for, as the Post, of this city, says, "there is an Allentown for every Sowden." [Laughter and applause.]

What else? Here, for example, are cotton-ties; which present another queer freak in this bill. Everybody knows what cotton-ties are; they are hoop-iron cut into lengths just large enough to go round a bale of cotton. Now, if the Southern cotton-planter wants some of this hoop-iron with which to bale his cotton, he goes to the custom-house at New York or Charleston and cuts off all he wants; and he does not have to pay a cent of duty; but if the farmer-con-

stituent of my friend who sits before me [Mr. Nelson], or your farmer-constituent, wants some hoop-iron of precisely the width and thickness, and goes to the custom-house to get it, the Government makes it pay one cent and a half of duty upon every pound he takes, while it lets the cotton-planter take his for nothing. If the Western farmer wants it for his bucket or his barrel or to go on his wagon-bed, or if the washerwoman wants it for her washtub, every one of these must pay a cent and a half a pound, under the philosophy of the gentlemen who framed this bill, while the cotton-planter gets his absolutely free of duty.

Gentlemen, is that fair? I appeal to Southern men who sit before me; I appeal to Northern Democrats who sit around me; is that fair upon any principle of justice or fair play? Talk about sectionalism! You raise the question in your bill; you make a sectional issue which I deeply regret, and I am sure you must upon serious reflection.

There are some other features in this bill which are a little singular. The proposed duty on white lead is 2 cents a pound, while orange mineral, which is made from white lead, is reduced to one cent and a half a pound. [Laughter.] That is another case of high duty upon raw material and low duty upon the finished product.

Why, what in the world has this bill done for the people anyhow? What has it done for the farmer? It has taken the duty practically off of everything he grows; I will not stop to give the items. It makes free practically every product of the farm, the forest, and mine.

It takes the duty off of wool. What does it give the grower in return? Does it give him anything free? Everything he buys is dutiable. The coat he wears, the hat that covers his head, his shoes, his stockings, his sugar, his rice, everything bears a duty and substantially everything he raises put on the free-list.

The duty on wool must go. What has this Democratic party given the agriculturists in return for this slaughter of their interests? I have looked this bill up and down, and I will tell you what they have done for the farmer. They have given him free sheep-dip. [Laughter and applause.] Sheep-dip is made free and the duty is released. My distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. LEE], who honors me with his presence here, knows what this article is. It is a preparation which is used on sheep. It is made up largely of the stems of tobacco. It has got a little sulphur in it. I believe; it has got a little lime in it. They put that on the free-list, and that is all they do for the farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. What good is that to the farmer after they have destroyed his flocks?

Mr. MCKINLEY. None. They leave the shears he clips his wool with at 45 per cent. ad valorem. They make his wool free and make the farmer pay 45 per cent. for the shears with which he clips his wool. [Laughter.]

But that is not all. The bell, the sheep bell—if my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] is here, if that golden-shod shepherd from Worcester is here [laughter and applause], he will understand. It is the bell that is put around the neck of the sheep to admonish the shepherd of the whereabouts of the wandering flock under his charge. I am told the gentleman has got on the outside. I learn now he is here in his seat; I am glad to see him. He knows what I am talking about. [Laughter.]

They have left them dutiable at 45 per cent. ad valorem. Why, the sheep even will be ashamed of you, gentlemen. [Laughter.]

Tin plates are made free. What are tin plates made of? Ninety-seven and a half per cent. are sheet-iron or sheet-steel; 2½ per cent. tin. Tin plates are made free. Sheet-iron, sheet-steel are dutiable at 2 cents a pound. Now, I shall not tax you further with the details of the bill. I might spend hours in pointing out like inconsistencies. I will leave their further discussion for the five-minute debate. I only give these samples so that my honorable and learned friend from Kentucky [Mr. BUCKENRIDGE] who replies to me, shall take them up and explain the principle on which these rates are fixed and these duties levied.

There is another thing which I wish to call attention to in connection with this bill, and that is the internal-revenue part of it. It seems to have escaped attention. Now, so far as the abolition of the tax on tobacco is concerned we are all in accord; but this new feature of the bill provides for the repeal of the law which authorizes the destruction of illicit stills when found in unlawful use. Under the present law if you find a man engaged in unlawful distilling, not having paid the tax or secured the license, the officer is authorized to go and destroy the whole outfit. This bill repeals that section of the law and provides that the still shall neither be mutilated nor destroyed, but preserved presumably for future violations of the law. [Laughter and applause.]

And in this bill further provision is made that in case a man is arrested for illicit distilling, the judge is charged especially with the duty of looking well to his comfort and to his well-being while he is in the custody of the officials of the law. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

That provision does not apply to any other class of criminals under any of our statutes; but if a man is engaged in violating the revenue

laws he must be tenderly looked after by the judge, who is directed to see that he is in every way made comfortable while serving out his sentence in prison. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

THE VICIOUS AD VALOREM SYSTEM INTRODUCED IN BILL.

Now there is one leading feature of this bill, which is not by any means the most objectionable feature, but which, if it stood alone, ought to defeat this entire measure; and that is the introduction of the ad valorem system of assessment to take the place of the specific system now generally in force. You all know the difference between the ad valorem system and the specific mode of levying duties. One is based upon value, the other upon quantity. One is based upon the foreign value, difficult of ascertainment, resting in the judgment of experts, all the time offering a bribe to undervaluation; the other rests upon quantity, fixed and well known the world over, always determinable and always uniform. The one is assessed by the yard-stick, the ton, and the pound-weight of commerce, and the other is assessed by the foreign value fixed by the foreign importer or his agent in New York or elsewhere; fixed by the producer, fixed by anybody at any price to escape the payment of full duties. Why, the valuation under the ad valorem system is not even uniform throughout the United States.

My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse], who listens to me now, knows that the valuations fixed upon imported goods at the port of Boston are often different from the valuations fixed on the same class of goods, costing the same, arriving in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, or Charleston.

So we do not have and can not have a uniform value, for the value is subject always to the cupidity or dishonesty of the foreign importer or producer. It is a system that has been condemned by all the leading nations of the world. There is not a leading nation that adheres to any considerable extent to the ad valorem rates of duty upon articles imported into its borders: and England has abandoned all ad valorem duties except one, for the very reason that there can be no honest administration of the revenue laws so long as the value is fixed thousands of miles away from the point of production and impossible of verification at home. Henry Clay said fifty years ago:

Let me fix the value of the foreign merchandise, and I do not care what your duty is.

Mr. Secretary Manning in his very able report made to the last Congress, has gone over the entire question, and he publishes in a

volume the opinions of the experts of the Treasury, the collectors, the naval officers, the special agents of the Department, all of them declaring that there is nothing left for the American Government to do but to abolish the ad valorem system and adopt the specific in the interest of the honest collection of the revenue and for the safety and security of reputable merchants. And the Secretary himself says, in language too strong and plain to be misunderstood, that it is the duty of Congress to abandon the ad valorem and establish specific duties.

I give below these opinions.

Naval officer Burt, of New York, says:

I have long been convinced that a change from ad valorem to specific rates would not only be a benefit to the revenues, but would go far to relieve their administration from the friction and inevitable injustice that have made it in a measure odious. I might give here a *résumé* of my reasons for this opinion, as frequently expressed officially hitherto, but I presume the Department is fully apprised of all the arguments adduced on either side. I will therefore simply say that the ad valorem system is theoretically the perfect system, and that this has engaged its support by those who have only had opportunity to view it as an abstract proposition. This prejudice in its favor must surely give way before the overwhelming evidences that in practice, particularly with high rates, it breeds injustice, contention, and commercial obstructions that are almost intolerable.

James D. Power, a special agent of the Treasury, in a report to the same Secretary, says:

Ad valorem rates of duty afford temptations and opportunities for fraud which can not be guarded against, even by the most rigid rules and vigilant watchfulness. The assessment of values under this system is based upon expert knowledge of values, the most uncertain and arbitrary method that could be devised. Under the ad valorem system fraud has prospered and demoralized the importing trade, which has passed from the hands of American citizens into the control of men who have taken advantage of our high import duties to enrich themselves at the expense of the revenue and the ruined trade of American wholesale firms. Fraud of this nature is difficult to detect and more difficult still to establish. In the absence of documentary proof it resolves itself into a mere difference of opinion between experts; and the owner of the suspected goods can at all times procure experts who will maintain the correctness of his invoice prices, or he may select an easier and more convincing and efficacious line of defense by procuring affidavits from his buyer or partner abroad to the effect that the invoice cost was the actual price paid for the goods.

Messrs. L. G. Martin and A. K. Tingle, special agents, make the following statement to the Secretary:

There can be no doubt that a change from ad valorem to specific rates would help to diminish the tendency to corrupt action and loss to the revenue by the incompetency or indifference of appraisers. The application of specific rates to all textile fabrics would undoubtedly be a work of great difficulty, particularly as to woolen goods, but it is believed that a schedule can be prepared by the skilled officers in the appraiser's department, with the aid of manufacturers and merchants, which would be satisfactory to all interested, except those who are profiting by the present system of undervaluation.

The late Secretary Manning sums up the objections to ad valorem rates, and I beg to quote his language. He exposes the vice of the system which this bill seeks to engraft upon our legislation:

Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices, or by undervaluations, or by any other means, under an ad valorem system, will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestably, they are even notoriously inherent in that system.

One advantage, and perhaps the chief advantage of a specific over an ad valorem system is in the fact that, under the former, duties are levied by a positive test, which can be applied by our officers while the merchandise is in possession of the Government, and according to a standard which is altogether national and domestic. That would be partially true of an ad valorem system levied upon "home value;" but there are constitutional impediments in the way of such a system which appear to be insuperable. But under an ad valorem system, the facts to which the ad valorem rate is to be applied must be gathered in places many thousand miles away, and under circumstances most unfavorable to the administration of justice. One hears it often said that if our ad valorem rates did not exceed 25 or 30 per cent. undervaluation and temptation to undervaluation would disappear; but the records of this Department for the years 1817, 1840, and 1857 do not uphold that conclusion.

This one feature of the bill ought to be enough to insure its defeat, and if the party associates of the late Secretary had given heed to his sound utterances this vicious mode of assessment would have no place in the bill. Instead of simplifying the collection of the revenues as the title of the bill declares, it will increase the difficulties now experienced, encourage fraudulent invoices, promote undervaluation, impair the revenue, and do incalculable injury to honest importers and merchants.

THE GENERAL EFFECT OF PROTECTION.

I now come to consider the general effect of the protective system upon our people and their employments. There is no conflict of interests and should be none between the several classes of producers

and the consumers in the United States. Their interests are one, interrelated and interdependent. That which benefits one benefits all; one man's work has relation with every other man's work in the same community; each is an essential part of the grand result to be attained; and that statesmanship which would seek to array the one against the other for any purpose is narrow, unworthy, and unpatriotic. The President's message is unhappily in that direction. The discussion had on this floor has taken that turn. Both have been calculated to create antagonisms where none existed.

The farmer, the manufacturer, the laborer, the tradesman, and the producer and the consumer all have a common interest in the maintenance of a protective tariff. All are alike and equally favored by the system which you seek to overthrow. It is a national system, broad and universal in its application; if otherwise it should be abandoned. It cannot be invoked for one section or one interest to the exclusion of others. It must be general in its application within the contemplation of the principle upon which the system is founded. We have been living under it for twenty-seven continuous years, and it can be asserted with confidence that no country in the world has achieved such industrial advancement, and such marvelous progress in arts, science, and civilization as ours. Tested by its results, it has surpassed all other revenue systems.

From 1789 to 1888, a period of ninety-nine years, there have been forty-seven years when a Democratic revenue tariff policy has prevailed, and fifty-two years under the protective policy, and it is a noteworthy fact that the most progressive and prosperous periods of our history in every department of human effort and material development were during the fifty-two years when the protective party was in control and protective tariffs were maintained; and the most disastrous years—years of want and wretchedness, ruin and retrogression, eventuating in insufficient revenues and shattered credits, individual and national—were during the free-trade or revenue-tariff eras of our history. No man living who passed through any of the latter periods but would dread their return, and would flee from them as he would escape from fire and pestilence; and I believe the party which promotes their return will merit and receive popular condemnation. What is the trouble with our present condition? No country can point to greater prosperity or more enduring evidences of substantial progress among all the people. Too much money is being collected, it is said. We say stop it; not by indiscriminate and vicious legislation, but by simple business methods. Do it on simple, practical lines and we will help you. Buy up the bonds, objectionable as it may be, and pay the nation's

debts, if you cannot reduce taxation. You could have done this long ago. Nobody is chargeable for the failure and delay but your own Administration.

Who is objecting to our protective system? From what quarter does the complaint come? Not from the enterprising American citizen; not from the manufacturer; not from the laborer, whose wages it improves; not from the consumer, for he is fully satisfied, because under it he buys a cheaper and a better product than he did under the other system; not from the farmer, for he finds among the employés of the protected industries his best and most reliable customers; not from the merchant or the tradesman, for every hive of industry increases the number of his customers and enlarges the volume of his trade. Few, indeed, have been the petitions presented to this House asking for any reduction of duties upon imports. None, that I have seen or heard of, and I have watched with the deepest interest the number and character of these petitions that I might gather from them the drift of public sentiment—I say I have seen none asking for the passage of this bill, or for any such departure from the fiscal policy of the Government so long recognized and followed, while against this legislation there has been no limit to petitions, memorials, prayers, and protests, from producer and consumer alike.

NO PUBLIC DEMAND FOR SUCH A MEASURE.

This measure is not called for by the people: it is not an American measure—it is inspired by importers and foreign producers, most of them aliens, who want to diminish our trade and increase their own; who want to decrease our prosperity and augment theirs, and who have no interest in this country except what they can make out of it. To this is added the influence of the professors in some of our institutions of learning, who teach the science contained in books and not that of practical business. I would rather have my political economy founded upon the every-day experience of the puddler or the potter than the learning of the professor, the farmer and factory hand than the college faculty. Then there is another class who want protective tariffs overthrown. They are the men of independent wealth, with settled and steady incomes, who want everything cheap but currency; the value of everything clipped but coin—cheap labor but dear money. These are the elements which are arrayed against us.

Men whose capital is invested in productive enterprises, who take the risks of business, men who expend their capital and energy in

the development of our resources, they are in favor of the maintenance of the protective system. The farmer, the rice-grower, the miner, the vast army of wage-earners from one end of the country to the other, the chief producers of wealth, men whose capital is their brain and muscle, who aspire to better their condition and elevate themselves and their fellows; the young man whose future is yet before him, and which he must carve out with his hand and head, who is without the aid of fortune or of a long ancestral line,—these are our steadfast allies in this great contest for the preservation of the American system. Experience and results in our own country are our best advisers, and they vindicate beyond the possibility of dispute the worth and wisdom of the system.

What country can show such a trade as ours, such commerce, such immense transportation lines, such a volume of exchanges, and such marvelous production from the raw material to the finished product. Its balance-sheet is without a parallel in the world's history—richest in agriculture, greatest in its domestic trade and traffic, and leading in manufactures any nation in Europe. Why abandon a policy which can point to such achievements and whose trophies are to be seen on every hand! The internal commerce of the United States is greater than the entire foreign commerce of Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Holland, Belgium, and Austria-Hungary. Why, a single railroad system in this country (that of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company) carries more tonnage and traffic in a single year than all the merchant ships of Great Britain. The whole of Europe has not built as many miles of railroad as this country has during some recent years, and in 1880 the whole known world did not lay as many miles of track as were laid across this country. Great Britain's foreign commerce equals about one-sixth of our domestic commerce. Can we do better under any other fiscal policy? We say not. Wise statesmanship commands us, therefore, to let well enough alone.

Sir Edward Sullivan, in a recent article in the *London Post*, makes these suggestive comparisons, which I beg every gentleman to hear :

Under free trade the masses must get poorer, because they get less employment. A well-known statistical work gives a comparison of the material progress of France under protection and England under free trade. If there is any truth in figures it ought to startle us from our free-trade dream.

The comparison is based on the returns of legacy duty:

In 1826 England was 10s. a head richer than France.

In 1850 England was 19s. a head richer than France.

In 1877 England was 5s. a head poorer than France.

France has 57 per cent. of her land under tillage, and it is increasing every year.

The United Kingdom has 30 per cent. of land under tillage, and it is diminishing every year, but the population of England increases much more rapidly than the population of France.

The commerce of England has increased 21 per cent. in ten years.

The commerce of France has increased 39 per cent. in ten years.

The commerce of the United States has increased 68 per cent. in ten years.

The commerce of the world has increased 26 per cent. in ten years.

So much for the blasting effect of free trade.

In Germany, so long ago as the 14th of May, 1882, Bismarck, in a speech before the German Reichstag, paid to the Republican tariff high eulogy. He said:

The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern time. The American nation has not only successfully borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterward disbanded its Army, found employment for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, given labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within its territory, and still by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less felt. Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective laws, I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States.

You may try protection by any test you will. You may try it not only by the condition of the individual citizen and his happiness and prosperity and the aggregate prosperity of the nation, but try it by the progress which has been made in invention and scientific development; try it by any standard you may raise, the protective system shows by its results that it surpasses any other. You can match it with no other.

Go to the Patent Office and examine the evidences furnished from that great register of the products of American genius. Take the States which have stood by the protective system, which have believed in it, which have been built up under it, and contrast them with the States whose Representatives have stood in unyielding opposition to the system on this floor. See what result you get. Take Connecticut, a little State, but a manufacturing one. In the year 1887 there were 788 patents granted to the inhabitants of that State, 1 for every 790 of its inhabitants, while for Arkansas the number of patents granted was 65, 1 for every 12,346. Take Massachusetts: In 1887 there were 1,875 patents granted to the people of that State, 1

to every 950 of her population, while to Kentucky there were 245 patents granted, or 1 to every 6,729 of her population. Take Illinois: 1,595 patents were granted to her people, 1 to every 1,929 of her population, while for Georgia there were 130, or 1 in every 11,862 of her population. Here is the list:

Taken from the Commissioner's report, for the year 1887.

STATES.	Patents.	One to every
		(Inhabitant.)
Connecticut	788	700
Arkansas	65	12,346
Massachusetts	1,875	950
Illinois	1,595	1,929
Kentucky	245	6,729
Georgia	130	11,862
New Jersey	988	1,144
Louisiana	112	8,392
New York	4,047	1,255
Mississippi	45	25,146
Ohio	1,477	2,165
North Carolina	66	21,208
Pennsylvania	2,109	2,030
South Carolina	52	19,145
Rhode Island	224	1,234
Tennessee	121	12,746
Vermont	112	2,966
Virginia	132	11,458
California	505	1,712
Texas	265	6,006

These figures need no comment; they point their own moral; they enforce their own lesson. They demonstrate better than any argument that I can make that invention and progress and the general diffusion of knowledge follow manufacturing and industrial enterprises. [Applause.]

A HOME MARKET.

The establishment of a furnace or factory or mill in any neighborhood has the effect at once to enhance the value of all property and all values for miles surrounding it. They produce increased activity. The farmer has a better and a nearer market for his products. The merchant, the butcher, the grocer, have an increased trade. The carpenter is in greater demand; he is called upon to build more houses. Every branch of trade, every avenue of labor, will feel almost immediately the energizing influence of a new industry. The truck farm is in demand; the perishable products, the fruits, the vegetables, which in many cases will not bear exportation and which a foreign market is too distant to be available, find a constant and ready demand at good paying prices.

What the agriculturist of this country wants more than anything else, after he has gathered his crop, are consumers, consumers at home, men who do not produce what they eat, who must purchase all they consume: men who are engaged in manufacturing, in mining, in cotton-spinning, in the potteries, and in the thousands of productive industries which command all their time and energy, and whose employments do not permit of their producing their own food.

The American agriculturist further wants these consumers near and convenient to his field of supply. Cheap as inland transportation is, every mile saved is money made. Every manufacturing establishment in the United States, wherever situated, is of priceless value to the farmers of the country. The six manufacturing States of New England aptly illustrate the great value of a home market to the Western farmer. These States have reached the highest perfection in skill and manufactures. They do not raise from their own soil, with the exceptions of hay and potatoes, but a small fraction of what their inhabitants require and consume; they could not from their own fields and granaries feed the population which they had in 1830, much less their present population. The most intense revenue-reformer, the most unenlightened Democrat, will have to confess that New England is indebted in large part for her splendid development to the protective system. Now, has her prosperity and progress been secured at the sacrifice of other interests and other sections? I answer no, but has brought, as I believe I shall be able to show, a positive blessing to all of our 60,000,000 of people.

In 1880 the population of these six States was over 4,000,000. The food products required by their people, the very necessities of their daily life in a large measure, came from other States and remote sections of the Union. They raised in 1880 but one-quarter of 1 per cent. of the total wheat production of the United States. They raised in the same year but one-half of 1 per cent. of the total crop of Indian corn, $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of the oats, 12 per cent. of the hay, and 13 per cent. of the potatoes which were produced in the United States. What did they consume? What did they buy of the Western farmer? Fifty millions of dollars' worth of meat were consumed by their industrial people in a single year. The extent of their needs is strikingly shown by the fact (obtained from the accounts of Commissioner Fink) that during the year 1884 "the trunk lines" brought into New England no less than 470,000 tons of flour and 950,000 tons of grain. At 200 pounds to the barrel of flour, this is an importation of 4,700,000 barrels, or one and one-fifth, nearly, for each inhabitant. During the same year there were exported from Boston and Portland, the only points in New England from which breadstuffs

are sent abroad, 2,100,000 barrels of flour, leaving for consumption within these States 2,600,000 barrels. These figures take no account of the large trade by water from New York. I am informed that a large part of the flour consumed in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Southern Massachusetts is received in this way, but no reliable statistics are available. It is reasonable, however, to suppose, and this comes to me from what I deem good authority, that the amount thus received and consumed offsets a large portion of the foreign exports to which I have referred.

Of the grain received during the same year rather less than 400,000 tons were exported, leaving for New England consumption 550,000 tons, for all of which these States were the customers of the West in addition to the amount grown upon their own soil. In addition to this, New England consumed, in 1886-'87, in her factories nearly one-fourth of the entire cotton crop of the country. More than this, she used in her woolen mills in 1880 fully one-half of the entire wool clip of the United States, and during the year 1886 she consumed more than one-sixth of the entire anthracite-coal production of the country and $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the bituminous-coal production, and every pound of both came from the Middle and Southern States.

Is not New England (I appeal to the gentlemen of the other side, I appeal to the farmers of the country) worth preserving? Is not the industrial system which makes such a community of consumers for agricultural products possible worth maintaining? Does not she furnish you a market worth fostering? Does not she give you a trade and an exchange of products worth your while to guard with the most considerate care? And does not her condition indicate the wisdom of the policy we advocate? Is not her market better for you than a foreign one? Is not New England a better customer for you, more reliable, more easily reached, more stable, than Old England? [Applause on the Republican side.] Is not Boston a better consumer for the people of the United States than London, New York than Liverpool, Pittsburgh than Manchester, Cincinnati than Birmingham? [Applause on the Republican side.]

New England buys of you for all her wants; Old England takes not a pound or a bushel from you except what she must have and cannot get elsewhere.

Now, let us contrast this home market of New England with the foreign market of Old England. In 1880 New England consumed 540,000,000 pounds of cotton, at 11.61 a pound, which in value then amounted to \$62,695,000, 20 per cent. greater than the per capita value of all our domestic exports to the United Kingdom, and this

was only New England's contribution to the Southern producers of cotton. She sends at least \$70,000,000 to the West and Northwest for her food supplies. She sends to the wool-growers of the Middle, Western, and Pacific States \$40,000,000 annually for their fleeces. I repeat, is not this market worth preserving, ay, cherishing, and does it not make us long to have New England thrift, New England enterprise, and New England politics more generally distributed throughout all sections of the country? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You can destroy this valuable home market by such legislation as is proposed in this bill; you can diminish this demand for food, for cotton, for wool, for flax, and hemp produced in other sections of the country by following the delusive theories of our friends on the other side of the House; you can diminish the capacity of the operatives to buy of you by diminishing their wages; you can drive them from the cotton and woolen factories to the farms; they will then drift to the West and Northwest, not to engage in manufacture, but in a great measure to become tillers of the soil, and instead of being as they are now, and as they will be under a proper tariff system, your consumers, they become your competitors. They go from the ranks of consumers to the ranks of producers; diminish the consumers and increase the producers. The foreign market for agricultural products is one of the delusions of free trade. If it ever had any real substance as against a good home market that has long since disappeared.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee says to the Western farmer, "Let New England go. Pass her by and go to Old England." Well, that is about as practical as the Democratic party ordinarily is. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Dunn, a prominent member of this House and chairman of one of its leading committees, and I remember to have heard him say what I now read from the RECORD:

The wheat producer of the Northwest is standing face to face with the wheat producer of India. A few years ago India shipped 40,000 bushels of wheat. Last year (1885) she put into the market 40,000,000 bushels. Can you protect the Northwest farmer against that labor? India can put wheat down in the markets of consumption in Europe cheaper than we can transport it from the fields of production to the markets of consumption; that is to say, India can produce and market her wheat in Europe for what it costs the farmer of the Northwest to transport his to the market of consumption, without allowing him for the cost of production. In other words, the transportation of wheat costs the American farmer as much as both transportation and production cost the India farmer.

In the face of a statement like this, from such high Democratic authority, how, I ask, is the wheat of the American farmer to reach the European market with any profit to our producers? And yet it is to this kind of competition the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee invites the American farmer. Do the farmers want such a market with such a competition? What their answer will be no man can doubt. They reject with indignation and scorn the chairman's moriation. [Applause.] The home market is the best, besides being the safest. It has got the most money to spend, and spends the most. It consumes the most; it is therefore the most profitable.

The masses of our people live better than any people in the world. Great Britain only buys our food products when she has not enough of her own and can reach no other supply. This market, therefore, is fitful and fluctuating, and cannot be relied upon as we can rely upon our own consumers. The foreign market under a revenue for agricultural products has not been encouraging in our own experience in the past. It promises less under such a system in the future.

INCREASED IMPORTATIONS THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL.

The chairman of the committee in opening this debate boldly announced that we must increase foreign importations to secure national prosperity. How much do the gentleman and the party with which he is associated desire to increase importations? Are they not large enough already? Are they not now crowding our producers and diminishing their annual productions? Are they not already making labor restless, filling it with apprehension and uncertainty as to the future? Is this country to be the dumping ground of foreign products? During the last fiscal year over \$233,000,000 in value of foreign merchandise was imported into the United States free of duty, and over \$450,000,000 additional was imported which paid a duty. Is this not enough? Do the iron and steel workers want further importations in their line, representing cheap labor, to compete with the product of their labor? Over \$50,000,000 in value of iron and steel manufactures was imported last year, every dollar of which represented foreign capital and foreign labor, which might well have been produced at home. Every ton could have been made here, and American hands were waiting to make it.

How much labor do you suppose was represented by the \$50,000,000 worth of iron and steel that came into this country last year? It would have taken 1,740 puddlers and helpers, working every day

for 300 days in the year, to have produced the scrap-iron that came from Europe last year. It would have taken 2,500 men 300 days to have produced the bar and structural iron, and steel billets, and slabs, and ingots which were imported into the United States last year. It would have taken 300 men 300 days, besides those engaged in preparing the raw material, to have produced the plates and sheets, the corrugated iron, and the steel in various forms imported last year. It would have taken 3,700 men 300 days to have made the wire rods and the nails and the screws and wire in various shapes which were imported into the United States last year. It would have taken 800 men 300 days to have made the washers, and the bolts, and the fish-plates, and railway-plates, the steel tire, hinge-iron, and tubes of steel which were imported into this country last year. It would have taken 500 men 300 days to have made the iron and steel rails which were brought into the United States from abroad last year. It would have taken 24,000 men to manufacture the tin-plate imported last year. Summing up these figures, 33,540 men, working for 300 days, would have been required to produce the \$50,000,000 worth of iron and steel which we imported last year. Do you want that volume increased? Ten million sixty-two thousand is the aggregate number of days' work that were taken from American workingmen, every day's work of which they could have performed, and were waiting ready to perform. [Applause.] Including all branches of labor required to manufacture the fifty millions of imported iron and steel and the manufacture thereof, taking into account the labor employed in the mining, transportation, and manipulation of the raw materials, and it would employ nearly, if not quite, one hundred thousand men.

I do not know what you think about it; but I would not permit a single ton of steel to come into the United States if our own labor could make it. [Applause.] Let American labor, as far as practicable, manufacture American products. [Applause.] And if you do not like it, you know what you can do. [Laughter.] This Government is made for Americans, native-born and naturalized; and every pound, every bushel, every ton, every yard of foreign product that comes into this country to compete with ours deprives American labor of what justly belongs to it.

Do the farmers want increased importations of agricultural products? Of barley alone there were \$6,152,000 of value imported last year, and of vegetables a value of \$2,276,000. The total imports of the products of agriculture for the year 1887 free and dutiable were in value \$197,308,240. Of this sum \$46,678,443 was admitted free of duty and the remainder paid a duty. Do the agriculturists want the

duties all removed and their products driven from this market? Seven million three hundred thousand dollars' worth of foreign glass came into this country last year. Do the glass-blowers want this volume increased? Five million five hundred and forty-five thousand dollars' worth of pottery of foreign make entered our market? last year. Do the potters want this vast sum augmented? Will the wool-growers who were compelled to compete with \$16,000,000 worth of foreign wool last year relish the prospect of having their product further displaced next year; and the labor engaged in woollen manufactories in this country, are they anxious that the \$44,000,000 worth of woollen goods imported in 1887 in competition with the products of their labor shall be multiplied in 1889? All these importations will be greatly increased if this bill shall become a law. Every invoice of foreign goods which comes here the like of which we can make crowds out just so much American labor. Is there to be no limit to this foreign invasion?

I answer, only to the extent that our people shall make importations impossible by reducing the cost of the home product. This will be the only restraint upon foreign merchandise glutting this market to the displacement of our own. If our present labor conditions are maintained—and this bill gets upon our statute-book—there will be no barrier in the way of a perfect inundation of foreign goods in the United States. It should not be forgotten that low duties or no duties substitute foreign imports for home-made and home-grown products, and to the extent of such substitution take work and wages from American labor. The effect of this bill, and there can be no other, is to increase importations, displace our own products by foreign ones, diminish the output of our factories and mills, curtail the demand for labor, and reduce the wages of those who may be able to get work. This result is as clear and manifest to me as the simplest mathematical problem, and we have only to look at the wage scale of competing nations to know what our labor will come to with free trade or its equivalent. We cannot compete with foreign nations without the restraint of a tariff unless we have equal conditions and equal labor cost. To do this we must introduce European conditions and European methods in the United States, and that is what this bill and all similar legislation mean.

“The trammels of trade must be removed” is the language employed by the friends of this bill. How and in what way? First, by removing the duty from raw materials used in manufacture, which of necessity will be at the expense and loss of those engaged in preparing them. But to a tariff reformer that is of little account. This trammel must go, to enable the domestic manufacturer to compete

with the foreign manufacturer at home and abroad. After this, and next in order, the trammel of high wages must be removed. This is the most important and essential of all. This is the chief obstruction. Free raw material will not equalize the condition of manufacturers at home with those abroad. Cheap labor, underpaid labor, underfed labor will be the next demand of the advocates of this bill. Some of them have been frank enough to avow it already. This is the inexorable logic of the situation. If we are to control the whole of our own market and send our manufactures across the sea, it can be accomplished in one way only, by reducing the cost of the home product to the same or below the cost of the foreign product. To do this every intelligent man knows involves an enormous reduction of the wages of American workingmen. To this a revenue tariff comes at last, and from which there is no escape; and against it every true American interest cries out in an emphatic and earnest protest.

I propose a wiser and more patriotic solution of the difficulties of our financial situation. If we will buy more American goods and less foreign, we will reduce the income of the Government and leave and increase the surplus among the people. If we will buy more American merchandise and less of foreign make, manufactures at home will run the year round and labor will be suitably rewarded and steadily employed. If we had some of that lofty patriotism evinced by the fathers, if we were more American in feeling, sentiment, and purpose, there would be fewer advocates of this bill.

AMERICAN WAGES AGAINST EUROPEAN WAGES.

There has been much effort made in this debate to show that, after all, American workingmen get no better pay than the workingmen of other countries. Let us consider this branch of the discussion for a little while, for if it be true that labor here is no better rewarded than elsewhere, then the strength of protection is much weakened. I beg to cite, against the unsupported statements of the gentlemen who have already spoken upon the other side, the testimony of American workingmen whose opportunity for information from experience in both countries, and otherwise, makes their evidence incontrovertible. From the statements made March 10, 1886, before the Committee on Ways and Means, I read. Some of this testimony is two years old, but the only reason it is so is because laboring men were not permitted to testify this year. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Roger Evans, workingman, speaking upon this subject, said:

Of course you must not gauge the American workingman by the amount of coarse bread and meat which will be necessary for him to subsist upon. It cannot be. The American workingman must have other things than those. He must be fed and clothed and be able to maintain his family as becomes the dignity of an American citizen.

Another, Mr. Philip Hagan, spoke as follows:

I was born under a free-trade government, and I believe that that free-trade government deprived me of an education. The reason of that was that I had to go to work when I was eight years of age; and I remember also my little brother going to work under that free-trade government when he was eight years of age. I remember well when there was a family of nine of us (including my father and mother), and when my wages for working in a mill were 10 cents per day. That was under a free-trade government. Subsequently I went up higher there to five shillings a day, or \$1.25. That was about the limit I could reach—six and sixpence a day—and having to pay 60 cents out of that to my helper.

Many members of this committee know all this just as well as I am stating it, and I am not going to detain you any longer; but I will state that as soon as my limited knowledge informed me that labor was protected in the United States I came here. I declared my intentions and I became a citizen of the United States. And now I have a family, and now I make regularly 14 shillings a day. The produce on which I lived in England came mostly from the United States, and certainly I ought to get it as cheap here as in England. I worked for five shillings a day in England, and I get 14 shillings a day here. Consequently I am able to send my children to school, and they are getting an education, which their father did not get under a free-trade government. I want to see these children raised up and educated as citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. Thomas Williams said:

As American citizens we can not be compelled to subsist upon what the working people of England, France, or other European countries subsist upon. The people of this country have made it just what it is, and in a very great measure the workingmen have made it what it is. Some of us have come across the Atlantic, leaving the land of our birth, and have come here with the expectations that we are going to better our condition. We have bettered it in a great measure. We will get along if you will let us alone. The manufacturers and ourselves will fight our own battles.

Mr. Thomas P. Jones said:

I came to this country to better my condition, and I am happy to say that I have bettered my condition. I have made more wages than I ever made in the old country.

It has been shown here to-day, and, as I think, very clearly, that this tinkering with the tariff is not for the best interests of the country; is not for

the best interests of the wealth-producers, of the men who built up this country. Then, gentlemen, I take it that it is your duty to throw this bill to the dogs. I certainly do not stand to dictate to you altogether in this matter, but I will assure you this far: that there is a school of education among the working people in this country, and that if this tinkering of the tariff is allowed to proceed; if you will, in spite of our remonstrances, go on destroying our interests and shutting up the industries of the country, our working people will be ere long sufficiently educated to step forth and say, "Gentlemen, thus far shall you go, and no farther." We will elect men and send them here to legislate for our interests if you will not do so. We have the power, gentlemen, and you know it.

Laborers in this country were never so cemented as they are to-day. One of the principal things which has helped us to that is this very bill which the honorable chairman has brought before this committee. Where I live, in Chicago, you would be surprised to see the feeling that exists among the working classes. And why? Because some of the people there worked in this country in free-trade times. I have a brother-in-law who, in free-trade times, traveled to his work 6 miles in the morning, getting there at sun-up, worked all day, and walked home at sundown, and all for a paltry 50 cents a day. I also have worked for 50 cents a day, but not in this country, thank God. I have worked for 25 cents a day, but I do not want to have to do it again. I have seen in the city of Glasgow, in Scotland, men working for 12 cents a day and a bowl of soup. That does not become an American citizen. We cannot have such a state of affairs here, and we will not have it.

I have a letter from Mr. William Barbour, of the Barbour Flax Spinning Company, of Paterson, N. J., under date of 31st of March, in which occurs the following:

DEAR SIR: As a stockholder and director of Barbour Flax-Spinning Company, of Paterson, N. J., I wish to make a statement to you regarding the flax-thread industry, and to call your attention to the effect which the proposed Mills bill would have upon it. * * *

While I am an American born, and the industry I represent in Paterson, N. J., is thoroughly American, I am also a large stockholder in a flax-spinning company in Ireland; and that you may judge of the relative wages paid in the two countries, I would state that the pay-rolls of the two mills, as recently compared, differed only about \$500, the number of hands in the Irish mill being 2,900 against 1,400 in the New Jersey mill. * * *

Yours truly,

WM. BARBOUR.

HON. W. MCKINLEY, JR.,

Washington, D. C.

That is, 1,400 American laborers are paid the exact sum which 2,900 laborers are paid for the same labor in Ireland, and yet gentlemen would have us believe there is no difference in favor of the American workingman. [Applause.]

The Singer Sewing-Machine Company maintains a factory in Glasgow, Scotland, as well as its works in New Jersey. It employs one-third more hands in its Scotch establishment, yet the pay-roll there is only half that of its American works, the actual figures being \$18,000 and \$35,000.

Mr. HERBERT (of Alabama).. Can the gentleman tell me the price a sewing-woman in Scotland pays for a sewing-machine and the price a sewing-woman in New Jersey pays for the same kind of a sewing-machine?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Yes, sir; I am told the prices are about the same, except a sewing-machine in Scotland costs more than a sewing-machine in America. [Laughter and applause.]

John H. Ross, superintendent Boston Thread and Twine Company, under date of April 23, 1888, says:

We are paying three times the average wages paid for similar labor throughout Europe.

Here is a letter under date of April 26, 1888, from the representatives of at least a half million workmen of the United States:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April, 26, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Having seen by the papers that Mr. Mills and others, in their speeches in the House of Representatives upon the tariff bill, have asserted the wages paid to labor were no higher in the United States than in Europe, we, the undersigned, desire to state, through you, to the members of Congress that such statements are misleading and false. Wages are higher in this country than in any other in the world. Notwithstanding the fact that the statements have been made by members on the floor of the House of Representatives that the tariff only benefits the manufacturer, and that they receive all the advantages from the protection given by the Government, we know that we receive our share of the benefits of protection on the industries we represent.

We therefore emphatically protest against any reduction of the duties that will bring us on a level with the low price paid for labor in Europe. We insist upon the maintenance of a strong protective tariff, in order to maintain an American standard of wages for American workmen.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM WEIHE, *President of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers.*

WM. MARTIN, *Secretary of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers.*

JOHN CONKLING, *Master Workman National Assembly Iron and Steel Workers, Knights of Labor.*

JOHN COFFEY, *Master Workman Glass Blowers' Assembly 149.*

LOUIS ARRINGTON, *Master Workman Glass Blowers' Assembly 143.*

JAMES CAMPBELL, *President of Local Assembly 300, Knights of Labor, Window Glass Workers of America.*

WM. J. SMITH, *President American Flint Glass Workers' Union.*

WM. J. DILLON, *Secretary.*

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Washington, D. C.

This bill proposes to equalize American production with European production by bringing down American wages to the level of European wages, and I give you notice here to-day that you cannot do it. [Applause.]

AGRICULTURAL WAGES.

Now as to farm wages here as contrasted with other countries. I have a letter from Mr. Dodge, the Statistician of the Agricultural Department:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1888.

The wages of white labor in agriculture in this country is about \$24 per month.

In England, the average wages paid for agricultural labor, according to J. S. Jeans, in the Royal Agricultural Society's Journal, was about \$12.65 per month. It has been reduced since 1880.

In the Argentine Republic the common farm hands get \$10 to \$12 per month.

In India agricultural wages are about \$20 to \$25 per year.

Wages here in the wool-growing industry are two or three times as much as in competing countries.

Consul Wamer, at Cologne, in his official report of May 21, 1886, to the State Department, gives a statement of the increase of exports from Germany to the United States; also the wages paid. The laborer, whether he works in iron or steel works, factories, stone-quarries, or railroads, earns as a rule from 47 to 70 cents per day, and for skilled labor he may get from 80 to 92 cents per day. Women, when employed, earn from 24 to 30 cents per day. Boys under sixteen receive 19 to 24 cents a day, and an extra strong boy may earn 30 cents. Working hours are from 6 to 6 in summer, and 7 to 7 in winter, with one hour for dinner.

The consul-general at Vienna, in speaking of the Austrian laborer, says a home of his own, though ever so modest, is beyond his reach.

Consul Tanner, at Chemnitz, Saxony, says:

The customary wages to hired servants on a farm are \$57.19 per year, with board and lodging, for men, and \$28.50 for females. Field hands are paid at the rate of 5½ cents per hour. Women receive 2½ cents per hour.

Speaking of their food, he says:

Sugar or sirup are never allowed, and but very little milk. Tea is never used. For dinner they have meat and vegetables three times a week, and always on Sundays.

This effectually disposes of the claim that wages in England and other countries are as high as here.

WAGES IN THE SOUTH AND PROTECTION TO RICE.

The wage question in the South is interesting, and I have seen it no better stated, and the reason for maintaining protection nowhere more strongly presented, than in the report made this year on the American rice industry, prepared by the Rice Association and addressed to the association of Savannah. I read:

During this period [from 1840 to 1860] the duty on foreign rice was 20 per cent. ad valorem. In all the rice-producing divisions of the country slave labor was then employed, and no foreign rice was imported.

It will be noted that slave labor operates as a positive prohibition to foreign imports. It takes the place of a protective tariff, and presents to labor a choice between the one and the other.

Cheap labor can successfully compete with cheap labor on equal terms and with equal chance of profits in the markets of the world without the aid of legislative protection, and what I have read shows the character of labor best adapted to free trade. This report says the conditions surrounding the American producer have entirely changed. Let me read:

Since the emancipation of the slaves the cost of agricultural labor in the South has been greatly increased. In the rice districts of the Carolinas and Georgia field labor ranges from 40 to 60 cents, and the best expert (not mechanical) labor to \$1 per diem.

So that no time since 1865 could rice have been cultivated as a staple product without the protection afforded by import duties upon foreign grain.

Now, with what labor does the Southern rice-grower compete? I will read from this report a quotation from the report of the United States minister at Pekin:

Coming now to the field-hand whom the farmer hires, we arrive at the substratum of labor. The average wages of an able-bodied young man is \$12 per annum, food, straw, shoes, and free shaving. Deducting \$4 for his clothing, he saves \$8 annually—or may do so.

Ten years' saving will enable him to buy one-third of an acre of land (value per acre, \$150) and necessary implements by which he can attain by his own labor a subsistence. * * * In ten years he can become possessor of two-thirds of an acre.

The report goes on further:

In Japan, the field-hands receive their food and lodging with wages from \$8.60 to \$12.96 per annum. The wages of females are about \$6 per annum.

In British India the per diem is 6 cents for males and 1½ cents for females.

In Kurnel the highest permanent wages are 50 cents per month.

In Borat men employed by the year get from 80 to 100 pounds of grain per month and from 44½ cents to \$1.98 per annum.

In Bombay and Madras laborers are paid from 6 to 12 cents per diem.

Hence the wages paid at the South in the rice-fields are many fold greater than those paid to laborers in the rice-fields of Asia. Two-thirds of the cost of production is disbursed in wages in the former.

The report then concludes:

The contrast in this element of cost should render unnecessary any further comment than that without the intervention of the existing import tax on Asiatic rice competition would seem impossible.

This argument I commend for its force and fairness, and it makes out a strong case for the rice-grower, who in my judgment deserves protection and which we cheerfully accord; but the same argument applies with equal force to domestic wool, flax, and hemp, and other products of agriculture and manufacture. They are all within the same principle; all of them cultivated and produced with wage-labor greatly in excess of that paid abroad. Yet these American products are to be severely crippled, if not wholly destroyed.

This statement of the rice-growers is a most striking demonstration of the wisdom and necessity of protection. It shows what is true in the North is true in the South. The chief and controlling question is one of labor, and so long as the labor cost here in any department of employment exceeds the labor cost in Europe, so long we must have a protective tariff which shall compensate for this difference. And whether the labor is in the rice-fields of Georgia and of the Carolinas, or in the wheat-fields of the Northwest, in the factories of New England, the mines of Maryland and Virginia, or the furnaces of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey, it must be protected against the less rewarded labor whose products come in competition with theirs. Either this tariff must be maintained to maintain the difference of wages or one of two things must inevitably occur: we must abandon production in many of the most valuable fields of industry here, or our labor must come down to the standard of the competing labor; and we may discuss our theories until the frosts of December and we cannot alter the fact.

This is the issue and it cannot be evaded.

LABOR NOT ASKING FOR IT—CHEAP CLOTHING.

It is a fact worthy to call to the attention of the House that a labor organization representing a million working men, with its

representatives in this city whose sole duty is to look after the interests of labor, have given no sign of approval of this bill. Not a petition has come through this source asking for its passage, or anything like it. Whatever utterance has been made has been in opposition and protest. Every member on this floor has observed the activity of this committee of Knights of Labor in regard to legislation affecting the interests of labor, but in all their vast constituency, found in every State of the Union, found in the fields, in the factories, workshops, and mines, no word or sign but of disapproval and condemnation has come.

The expectations of cheaper clothes is not sufficient to justify the action of the majority. This is too narrow for a national issue. Nobody, so far as I have learned, has expressed dissatisfaction with the present price of clothing. It is a political objection; it is a party slogan. Certainly nobody is unhappy over the cost of clothing except those who are amply able to pay even a higher price than is now exacted. And besides, if this bill should pass, and the effect would be (as it inevitably must be) to destroy our domestic manufacturing, the era of low prices would vanish, and the foreign manufacturer would compel the American consumer to pay higher prices than he has been accustomed to pay under "the robber tariff," so called.

I represent a district comprising some 200,000 people, a large majority of the voters in the district being workingmen. I have represented them for a good many years, and I have never had a complaint from one of them, that their clothes were too high. Have you? [Applause on the Republican side.] Has any gentleman on this floor met with such complaint in his district?

Mr. MORSE (of Massachusetts). They did not buy them of me.

Mr. MCKINLEY. No! Let us see; if they had bought of the gentleman from Massachusetts it would have made no difference, and there could have been no complaint. Let us examine the matter.

[Mr. McKinley here produced a bundle containing a suit of clothes, which he opened and displayed amidst great laughter and applause.]

Come, now, will the gentleman from Massachusetts know his own goods? [Renewed laughter.] We recall that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means talked about the laboring man who worked for ten days at a dollar a day, and then went with his ten dollars wages to buy a suit of clothes. It is the old story. It is found in the works of Adam Smith. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I have heard it in this House for ten years past. It has served many a free-trader. It is the old story, I re-

peat, of the man who gets a dollar a day for his wages, and having worked for the ten days goes to buy his suit of clothes. He believes he can buy it for just \$10; but "the robber manufacturers" have been to Congress, and have got 100 per cent. put upon the goods in the shape of a tariff, and the suit of clothes he finds cannot be bought for \$10, but he is asked \$20 for it, and so he has got to go back to ten days more of sweat; ten days more of toil; ten days more of wear and tear of muscle and brain to earn the \$10 to purchase the suit of clothes. Then the Chairman gravely asks is not ten days entirely annihilated?

Now, a gentleman who read that speech or heard it was so touched by the pathetic story that he looked into it and sent me a suit of clothes identical with that described by the gentleman from Texas, and he sends me also the bill for it, and here is the entire suit, "robber tariffs and taxes and all" have been added, and the retail cost is what? Just \$10. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] So the poor fellow does not have to go back to work ten days more to get that suit of clothes. He takes the suit with him and pays for it just \$10. [Applause.]

But in order that there might be no mistake about it, knowing the honor and honesty of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse], he went to his store and bought the suit. [Laughter and cheers on the Republican side.] I hold in my hand the bill.

Mr. STRUBLE (of Iowa). Read it.

Mr. MCKINLEY (reading):

Boston, May 4, 1888.

J. D. Williams, bought of Leopold Morse & Co.; men's, youths', and boys' clothing; 131 to 137 Washington street, corner of Brattle. To one suit of woolen clothes, \$10. Paid.

[Renewed laughter and applause.]

I never knew of a gentleman engaged in this business who sold his clothes without a profit. [Laughter.] And there is the same \$10 suit described by the gentleman from Texas that can be bought in the city of Boston, can be bought in Philadelphia, in New York, in Chicago, in Pittsburgh, anywhere throughout the country at \$10 retail the whole suit, coat, pants, and vest, and 40 per cent. less than it could have been bought in 1860 under your low tariff and low wages of that period. [Great applause.] It is a pity to destroy the sad picture 'of the gentleman from Texas which was to be used in the campaign, but the truth must be told. But do you know that if it was not for protection you would pay a great deal more for these clothes? I do not intend

to go into that branch of the question, but I want to give one brief illustration of how the absence of American competition immediately sends up the foreign prices, and it is an illustration that every man will remember. My friend from Missouri [Mr. Clardy], who sits in front of me, will remember it. The Missouri Glass Company was organized several years ago for the manufacture of coarse fluted glass and cathedral glass. Last November the factory was destroyed by fire. Cathedral glass was their specialty. Within ten days from the time that splendid property was reduced to ashes the foreign price of cathedral glass advanced 28 per cent. to the American consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.] Showing that whether you destroy the American production by free trade or by fire it is the same thing; the price goes up to the American consumer, and all you can do is to pay the price the foreigner chooses to ask. [Renewed applause.]

THE POOR MAN'S BLANKETS.

Now, the gentleman had a lot of blankets here the other day. The very climax of the gentleman's speech was reached when he came to a description of the American blankets, and the enormous burdens that the tariff laid upon the poor man's bed and covering. Why, you would have supposed that he was enunciating the national issue for 1888, and I think really that is about all they have left now that civil-service reform is gone. [Laughter.]

Now what is the fact? He told you that for one pair of 5-pound blankets, which he exhibited, the price was \$2.51, the labor cost 35 cents, the tariff \$1.90, and the difference between the labor and the duty \$1.55. Then the gentleman from Texas turned to this House and to his admiring associates and listening audience and said: "Why does not the manufacturer give the laborer that \$1.55, the difference between the labor cost and the duty?" which inquiry was followed by deafening applause.

Did he not leave the impression upon the mind of every one that the manufacturer got the duty? He asked why did he not give it to the laborer? and turning he said: "Of course he would not do that; he put it into his pocket." I will tell you the reason, or at least a sufficient reason, why the manufacturer did not give it to the laborer, It was because he did not get it himself.

I do not know where the gentleman got his figures, but I have a careful statement from one of the leading blanket manufacturers of this country, and I intend to give the facts fully.

Blankets are numbered according to grade and according to weight. There are several grades of five-pound blankets numbered

1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. A No. 1 five-pound blanket made in the city of Philadelphia sells for \$1.72. The labor represented in the blanket is 87½ cents; the duty is \$1.02. Of a scarlet blanket, five pounds, the price is \$2.27; the labor is 87½ cents; the duty is \$3.17. Of the white all-wool Falls of Schuylkill blanket the price is \$3.62; the labor \$1.05; the duty \$2.60. Of the Gold-Medal blanket the price is \$4.53; the labor \$1.05; the duty \$3.50.

Now, if the duty was added to the cost, what would the American manufacturers get for these blankets? They should get for the first blanket \$2.74. How much do they get? They get only \$1.72. They should get for the second blanket, duty added, \$3.77. How much do they get? They get \$2.27. They should get for the third \$5.12. How much do they get? They get \$3.17. They should get, duty added, for the fourth class \$6.22. How much do they get? They get \$4.35. They should get, duty added, for the highest grade \$8.03. How much do they get? They get \$4.05.

What did these same blankets cost in 1860 under a revenue tariff, under the free-trade domination of this country by the Democratic party? What did we pay for the same blankets that year as contrasted with what we pay now? The blanket that sells to-day for \$1.02 sold in 1860 for \$2. The blanket that sells now for \$1.45 sold in 1860 for \$2.50. The blanket that sells now for \$1.31 sold in 1860 for \$2.25. The blanket that sells now for \$1.90 sold in 1860 for \$3.50. The blanket that sells now for \$2.58 sold for \$3.75 in 1860. The blanket that sells now for \$4.35 sold for \$7.50 in 1860. The blanket that sells for \$5.85 now sold for \$10 in 1860. The blanket that sells now for \$6.80 sold for \$13 in 1860.

PRICES OF 1860 AND 1888 COMPARED.

Now let us see how the wages are, for that is an essential element in this question. In 1860 a spinner got \$6 a week in this same establishment, and I am speaking from the books of the manufacturer. It is no idle and hearsay, second-hand statement that I am making, nor does it come from any foreign source, nor is it based on any information from abroad. It is taken from the actual books of a manufacturer of blankets in Philadelphia, who has been manufacturing for a great many years. A spinner got for a week's work in 1860, \$6. What does he get now? Fifteen dollars. Six dollars a week in 1860, and \$15 a week in 1888! A piecer boy got \$1.15 a week in 1860, and he gets \$3.50 now. A weaver got \$4 in 1860, and he gets \$10 in 1888. A finisher, unskilled, got \$4.15 in 1860, and he gets \$9 in 1888. A skilled finisher got \$6 in 1860, and he gets \$16 in 1888. A dye-house

hand, unskilled, got \$4.25 in 1860, and he gets \$9 in 1888. A common laborer got \$4 in 1860, and he gets \$7.50 in 1888. A skilled laborer got \$4.50 in 1860, and he gets \$9 in 1888. An engineer got \$6.50 in 1860, and he gets \$16 in 1888.

The weekly earnings of the spinner in 1860 could buy three pairs of cheap blankets for one week's work. The spinner under American protection in 1888, for the price of one week's work can buy fifteen pairs of blankets. Talk about productive capacity! Think about buying capacity! The spinner buys his blankets for one-half what they cost him in 1860; and he gets two and a half times as much for his labor in 1888 as he got in 1860. Do you wonder these men do not like your bill? [Applause.] Do you wonder these men condemn the action of the committee for not listening to their protests? Why, you are preparing here to-day--and that is the purpose and effect of this bill--you are preparing here to reduce the scale of American wages. But I am not through with the blanket issue. You may think that what I have already given is sufficiently exhaustive, but I have an actual transaction here that I know will be of interest to the members of this House, and, therefore, at the expense of wearying your patience, I am going to ask your attention to it. [Cries of "Go on!"]

THE UNITED STATES BUYING FOREIGN BLANKETS.

On the 25th of March, 1887, the United States Government advertised for bids for the purchase of blankets for the use of the medical department of the Army. This was in 1887, under the present Administration. There were foreign bids and there were American bids. Now, if the President is right in saying that the duty is added to the cost, then the foreign cost, duty added, ought to be just equal to the American price. Now, what are the facts of this transaction? As I have said, there was a foreign bid, and there was an American bid. The foreign bid was for a four-pound blanket for medical purposes, to be furnished for \$2.25 $\frac{3}{16}$. For the same four pound blanket for the same purposes, the American bid was \$2.56, there being a difference of 30 $\frac{3}{16}$ cents. Who, who do you suppose got the contract? There was a foreign bid, and an American bid, and the difference between the bids was 30 cents on each blanket. Now tell me which manufacturer, the American or English got the contract? Is there anybody here who would not have given it to the American, there being a difference of only 30 cents between the bids?

Is there any gentleman on this floor who would send abroad to get a pair of blankets merely to save 30 cents on them, thus taking

away from the American manufacturer and the American farmer and the American laborer that much business? However that may be, that contract did go abroad. English labor, with foreign wool, made those 2,000 blankets for the use of our army. American labor was boycotted and they came in without paying any duty. The Government took advantage of a law that stands on the statute-book and admitted them free of duty. There being so little revenue in the Treasury, it was necessary, of course, to save every penny, so they took advantage of that law which permits the United States to bring in goods free of duty.

Now let us look at the figures. The duty on blankets of that quality is 18 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. Eighteen cents a pound upon 2,000 blankets, 4 pounds each, is \$1,440; 35 per cent. ad valorem is \$1,576 40, making a total duty upon those 2,000 blankets, which were bought from a foreign blanket maker, of \$3,016.40. The cost of those blankets, free of duty, amounts to \$4,504; with the duty added the total would be \$7,520.40.

Now, if the President is right and if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is right in saying that this duty is added to the price to the American consumer, then \$7,520.40 is exactly what the American price would be.

What was the American price? The American price was \$5,120. That is, it was \$2,400 less than the foreign cost, duty added. Without any duty, the difference between the cost of the American and the cost of the foreign blankets, the whole 2,000, was about \$600. Now you see the American manufacturer does not get the duty, and that, I submit, is a sufficient reason why he does not give it to his workmen. I am very sorry that the President of the United States did not know of this transaction, which had occurred under his own administration, so that he might have avoided making the blunder which he made in his message when he said that the duty was added to the cost. And I do not know what those around me may think about it, but I am very sorry that our Government went abroad and bought those blankets just to save 30 cents apiece on them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I wish that this Government of ours, which is supported by its own people, and not by foreigners, would patronize its own people. I think that is an example of patriotism which should be set by those charged with public administration. I wish the men who pay the taxes to support this Government, to pay the President's salary and other expenses of the Government, would be patronized when the Government has anything to buy, don't you?

And are you not a little ashamed of this transaction, all of you? I do not know whether the like was ever done under any former administration or not; but it never ought to be done, except in time of war or great public necessity, by any future administration of any party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

ALL EUROPE INTERESTED IN THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL.

All Europe is watching the progress of this bill. Its immediate promoters are not following it with keener vigilance and more absorbing interest than their foreign sympathizers. All trades, all manufacturers across the Atlantic, are watching it with the deepest concern and anticipating the rich harvest which awaits them when our gates shall be opened, our industrial defenses torn down, and free and unrestrained access to our splendid markets afforded for the products of their cheap labor.

I have in my hand the Pottery Gazette, published in London, under date of January 2, 1888, from which I read:

Earthenware is reported to be reduced to 30 per cent. This will help the trade, but we trust the men and masters here will not be too sanguine as to results and upset the trade.

Their information upon the earthenware schedule is quite accurate; they had it in advance of the minority members of the committee, and while thoroughly pleased the editor of the Gazette feels constrained to advise the men and masters not to be too sanguine as to results and thereby upset the trade and defeat the bill. He advises them not to rejoice too soon; the news is almost too good to be true, and too much ecstasy on their part might prejudice it before the American House. Why should they rejoice when our tariff goes down? Our workingmen and employers have no such feeling. They dread it; they oppose it; they know what it means to them. They know that it will benefit the foreign rival and bring distress to them.

The reduction of duties upon earthenware will help Staffordshire, England, and their people know it well, while it will hurt American potters and the labor they employ.

Again I read:

Our American friends are expected over shortly—

They are detained here during the pendency of this bill—

when we shall hear what the effect is to be of the promised alteration in their tariff. The protected manufacturers in the States are already making efforts to stop the reduced imports, but it will be useless,

With what confidence they speak! They mistake the temper of our people. They are staking too much upon the fulfillment of Democratic pledges.

This long nursed and favored class must give way a little to the consumer, whose long suffering has at length come to the front.

The generous sympathy which the English manufacturer has for the American consumer is touching indeed.

The consumers are as ten to one of the United States inhabitants, and the protection to the pottery and glass manufacturer of the commoner description represents the cost of labor many times over.

This reads like the speech of the gentleman from Texas. It sounds so like the Democratic speeches of the last two weeks that we might well conclude that the gentleman of the majority on this floor were representing an English and not an American constituency.

Again I read:

Is this fair to the housekeeper? Is it right? Nay, is it just?

This sympathy would have been more highly appreciated by the American consumer had it been extended at a time when the Staffordshire potteries controlled the American market, before we had become successful competitors, and when they were charging us 100 per cent. more for the coarse tableware that went into the houses of the masses than we now have to pay, resulting from the competition created by our own potteries. The hope of foreign producers is in the Democratic party.

Foreign producers are already preparing for the new order of things. They are already establishing agencies in the United States, preparing to invade and occupy this market.

I have among my notes a letter from Andris Jochams, of Charleroi, Belgium, proprietors of the La Providence Rolling Mills, which gives unmistakable evidence of preparation for the passage of this bill.

Let me read the letter:

CHARLEROI, *le 14th March*, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I beg to take notice that we have appointed Messrs. Weir, Smith & Rogers as our sole and general agents in the United States of America, for the sale of our architectural iron, as per circular inclosed, and you will oblige us in addressing your demands to them in future.

With the prospect of a reduction in duties on architectural iron and steel

in your country we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us.

We remain, dear sirs, with much respect, your obedient servant,

ANDRIS JOCHAMS.

Messrs. WEIR, SMITH & ROGERS, 41 Broadway, New York.

The American public, it will be observed, is assured that "with the prospect of reduction of duties on architectural iron and steel in your country we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us." Reduced duties are to increase their profit which, for the time, at least, is to be divided so as to give to the American importer a "nice profit."

TRUSTS.

There has been much discussion about trades and combinations in the course of this debate—trusts to control prices, diminish production, extinguish competition—and these are made a fruitful theme for vicious assaults upon the tariff. This is the only new feature that has been developed in the tariff discussion, and therefore deserves passing attention. I have no sympathy with combinations organized for this or any other purpose, to control the supply and thereby control prices. I regard all such as against public policy and opposed to fair and legitimate trade. They are, however, in no wise related to the tariff, and the tariff is in no way responsible for them.

There is nothing in the tariff laws to promote or even suggest them. They are of foreign origin—they originated in free-trade countries. They can and do exist among producers and factors not in any way affected by the tariff. They are of recent date in the United States. The most widely known trusts of the country are not engaged in what are termed "protected industries." The oil trust and the whisky trust, which are so commanding and powerful, which make prices and alter them, control supply and production, these surely cannot be charged to a protective tariff, for nothing which they make or merchandise is subject to protective tariffs. The most oppressive trusts—oppressive to the American consumer—are those which deal in foreign goods, and all of which will be promoted and strengthened by the passage of this bill.

There is a trust or combination made up of all the plate-glass manufacturers of Europe. I have here a circular which is dated London, 25th of April, 1887, and which reads:

DEAR SIR: We beg to inform you that the Associated Plate-Glass Manufacturers have revised their prices for plate-glass of all descriptions, and that, withdrawing all previous quotations, we inclose you herewith our tariff of prices, the discount from which will be 30 per cent., with the exception of glazing glass used for silvering purposes, the discount from which will be 25 per cent.

We are, dear sir, yours, respectfully,

LONDON AND MANCHESTER PLATE-GLASS
MANUFACTURING COMPANY (LIMITED).
UNION PLATE-GLASS COMPANY (LIMITED).
PILKINGTON BROTHERS.

A de GRAND RY. AGENCE GÉNÉRALE DES GLACERIES, *Belges*.

— This trust is still in force. Here is a foreign combination to control the price of plate-glass, and the gentlemen on the other side are engaged in making the monopoly more complete and controlling by reducing the import duties now paid on their product and by relieving them of a burden they now have to bear, and thus enabling them to break down American competition, which alone has reduced the price of plate-glass, and now prevents the most extortionate exactions for the foreign product upon American consumers.

Here, again, is an importers' trust in the same line of goods. I read from the New York Herald of February 28 an account of the investigation by the New York Legislature:

THE GLASS TRUST.

Mr. James H. Heroy, an importer of plate and French glass, was next called to tell what he knew about the glass trust. He is a spry old gentleman who has been in the business for fifty years. Colonel Bliss asked the witness to identify a circular. It is a very peculiar circular, and will open the eyes of the public, if not the eyes of the committee. It is as follows:

“HENRY C. MARRINER,

“Plate and sheet-glass importer, No. 126 South Fifth avenue:”

“We beg leave to quote you 70, 10, and 5 per cent. discount from the price-list, January 20, 1887, for French window-glass. In case you wish to make any large purchases we can make you extra discounts as follows: If you receive from us or any members of our association in New York (which includes all the regular importers), either all from one house or part from each of the houses, one hundred boxes in one calendar month, you are entitled to an extra discount of 5 per cent.; or if the deliveries to you in any one calendar month from any or all of these houses should amount to \$1,000, then you will be entitled to an extra discount of 10 per cent. This is done, as you will see, to give large purchasers the advantage over small buyers, which they have been long entitled to, but which could not be given to them until we made our present organization to regulate prices.

"This arrangement of rebates takes effect from February 1.

"We can also make deductions from the new price-list of January 5, 1888, for colored, enameled, ground, and cathedral glass, extra discounts, as follows:

"For orders of twenty cases or 2,000 feet or more at one time, 10 per cent. discount.

"For import orders of 7,500 feet or more of cathedral and one hundred cases or more colored, enameled, and ground glass we will make special prices, according to the conditions of the order.

"Yours, very truly,

"HEROY & MARRINER."

NOTHING DONE IN A HURRY.

There was no doubt about the intention of that trust. Mr. Heroy said, "it was simply" to make prices below which they would not sell their goods. At the last meeting he attended he thought it was the desire of the combination to reduce prices, and added, "We have not yet decided what to do in the case of a man who undersells us. We do not decide these things in a hurry. As a result of the combination prices have advanced. I can't tell exactly the amount of the business done. It is largely exaggerated, but, including all branches, it is about \$20,000,000."

I have also in my possession a copy of the trust contract. Not content with making this combination among themselves, they sought in every way possible to induce our American producers of plate-glass to join them and assist in fleecing the American public.

There is a foreign trust on china and earthen ware. I have the evidence here in the London Pottery Gazette of March 10, 1888, from which I read:

If any manufacturers are not true to the rules of the new association the bond they will have signed will enable their fellow-manufacturers to sell them up "rump and stump." Nothing but the state of dire necessity into which the trade has fallen would tempt men to put their hands to such a bond. The scheme has just been successful with the china manufacturers. They have just obtained a second advance.

If the keen buyers who always want to beggar the trade and reduce prices say to a manufacturer who will not sell at lower than the fixed rate, "Well, if I am forced to pay the association price I will not buy from you," such manufacturer can reply, "All right; if you buy from another, and I have to stand for orders, I shall get my pull out of your business, for our rules will not let me suffer through refusing to reduce at your request." So you see one manufacturer cannot be played off against the others.

There is a foreign tin trust and a foreign iron trust to control prices and deprive the public of the advantages of legitimate com-

petition. All these are to be benefited by this bill. Its author should change its title so as to make it read, "An act to promote foreign trusts and combines and break down American competition." We should set our faces against all these unnatural associations. We should crush out those at home, and do nothing to encourage those abroad who organize to prey upon the American market. We can control the former, but the latter, while robbing our own citizens, are beyond our control and out of our jurisdiction.

PROTECTION SENTIMENT EXTENDING.

While the Democratic majority, aided by the active force of the Administration, is seeking to break down the protective system, under which we have realized such unexampled prosperity, what do we witness elsewhere and in other countries? Within the last six months there was held a great meeting in England, representing thirty thousand workingmen. The meeting was called to consider the depressed condition of labor, and to demand such a change of the fiscal legislation as would abandon free trade in the United Kingdom and adopt a protective tariff. They resolved—

First. That this meeting is strongly of opinion that the time has come when all classes interested in the nation's prosperity should unite in demanding a revision of its fiscal system.

Second. That this meeting records its opinion that all articles imported from abroad should bear a fair share of taxation with the same articles produced at home.

These resolutions, with a suitable memorial, were presented to the British Parliament. In the same month the Chamber of Commerce of Lincolnshire, England, adopted the following resolutions:

That this meeting is of opinion that the fearful depression both of trade and agriculture are intimately connected with, and both are caused by, foreign competition, resulting in low prices, which are affecting all the industries of this country; that false free trade is a failure obtained at the expense of the native producer. This meeting, therefore, begs to urge of their representatives in Parliament and the government the necessity of speedily taking measures to prevent the ruin impending over trade, and especially over the land of this country and all concerned in it, either as owners, cultivators, or tradesmen, and that a reconsideration should at once take place of our present fiscal arrangement.

The working people of England find that competition with countries employing cheaper labor too oppressive to bear longer, and are demanding in the interest of themselves and families to be saved from

the further degradation it will entail. It is not American competition they dread; it is the competition of France, Germany, and Belgium—countries whose labor is even more poorly paid than the labor of England. They have come to appreciate at last that nothing but tariffs which are defensive in their character will save them from utter ruin and destitution. We will be in precisely the same situation if this bill shall become a law. Our competition is with all the world, for no labor is so well paid as ours, and being the highest paid labor invites the sharpest competition from the lowest. We will have no objection to free trade when all the competing nations shall bring the level of their labor up to ours; when they shall accept our standard; when they shall regard the toiler as a man and not a slave; but we will never consent while we have votes and the power to prevent the dragging down of our labor to that of the European standard. [Applause.] Let them elevate theirs; let them bring theirs up to our level, and we will then have no contention about revenue or protective tariffs. We will meet them in open field, in home and neutral markets, upon equal footing, and the fittest will survive. [Applause.] This is no time to seriously think of changing our policy. The best sentiment, the practical judgment of mankind, is turning to it. Sir Charles Tupper said a year ago in the Canadian House of Commons:

No person who has carefully watched the progress of public events and public opinion can fail to know that a very great and marked change has taken place in all countries, I may say, in relation to this question (protection). * * * In England, where it was a heresy to intimate anything of that kind a few years ago, even at the period to which I am referring, a great and marked change in public opinion has taken place. Professor Sidgwick, a learned Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and professor of moral philosophy in that great university, and the gentleman who read at the meeting of the British Association in 1886 a paper on political economy, has published a work in which opinions that would have been denounced as utterly fallacious and heretical at that time have been boldly propounded as the soundest and truest principles of political economy. * * * Statesmen of the first rank, men occupying high and commanding positions in public affairs in England, have unhesitatingly committed themselves to the strongest opinion in favor of fair protection to British industry.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Why, even Canada, a dependency of free-trade England, is too wise to favor the false doctrines of her mother, and has rejected her teachings, and to-day is prosperous under a protective system, which she in the main borrowed from us. I wish every citizen might read

the budget speech of the minister of finance in Canada, and contrast it with that of my honored but misguided friend from Texas. On the 12th of May, 1887, in the Commons, Sir Charles Tupper, in speaking of a previous period in the history of Canada under free trade, said:

When the languishing industries of Canada embarrassed the finance minister of that day, when instead of large surplus large deficits succeeded year after year, the opposition urged upon that honorable gentleman that he should endeavor to give increased protection to the industries of Canada, which would prevent them from thus languishing and being destroyed. We were not successful—I will not say in leading the honorable gentleman himself to the conclusion that that would be a sound policy, for I have some reason to believe that he had many a misgiving on that question—but at all events we were not able to change the policy of the gentleman who then ruled the destinies of Canada. As is well known, that became the great issue at the subsequent general election of 1878, and the Conservative party being returned to power, pledged to promote and foster the industries of Canada as far as they were able, brought down a policy through the hands of my honored predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, * * * and I have no hesitation in saying that the success of that policy thus propounded and matured from time to time has been such as to command the support and confidence of a large portion of the people of this country down to the present day.

Under this system he proceeds to show that Canada has enjoyed a prosperity the like of which she never enjoyed before, and then, instead of recommending a reduction of duties, proposes the increase of duties upon certain foreign merchandise, to the end that Canadian industries may be fostered thereby.

Here is what the gentleman from Texas, our premier, says. Mark the contrast:

Now, sir, what has been the result of this policy [of protection]? Enormous taxation upon the necessities of life has been a constant drain upon the people; taxation, not only to support the expenditures of the Government, but taxation so contrived as to fill the pockets of a privileged class and take from the people five dollars for private purposes for every dollar that it carries to the public Treasury. * * * This is one of the vicious results, etc. * * * What use have our manufacturers for the tariff at all? Why are they constantly beseeching Congress not to ruin them by reducing war rates? * * * It is a policy that is at war with the institutions of this country—the concentration of the wealth of the country in the hands of a few.

My friend has not read with profit or purpose the history of his country. Wedded to the economic teachings of Calhoun and Walker, he has not observed their contradiction and refutation in the

matchless progress of his country. He still lives in the past. The condition of his own State, her boundless resources, appeal to him, but her voice, if heard, is not heeded. He seeks to throw across her pathway and the pathway of the Republic the tattered dogmas of a half century ago and stop the wheels of progress, interrupt our advancing civilization, and stifle the just aspirations of the people. The country is in no frame of mind for such retrogression; against it every instinct of humanity revolts, every noble sentiment protests.

If the people of the country want free trade or a strictly revenue tariff it is their privilege to have it. The majority voice should be controlling, but it must be after a full, fair, and candid expression. I do not believe that a majority in this House were instructed by their constituents to vote for this bill or any other committed to the doctrine of free trade. If the issue had been so understood many of the gentlemen who are promoting this legislation would not be here. I do not believe the country understood in 1886 that if the Democratic party carried a majority in the House it would do what is now being proposed. How many Representatives on that side of the House would have been left at home upon a platform favoring free wool and substantially free agricultural products? More by far than your majority.

LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON THE ISSUE BETWEEN A REVENUE TARIFF
AND A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The opportunity of the people of this country is next November. If they want free trade they can so vote, but they must have it after full discussion. The majority now on the floor of this House were not instructed by the elections in 1886 to vote for this bill; there was no such issue. Wherever we sought to make it the issue it was obscured or denied by Democratic protectionists in the North. Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the friend of labor. [Laughter.]

The House of Representatives, I say, was not elected upon that issue. I challenge your party, under the instructions given you by the people two years ago, to force this measure through the House.

MR. SCOTT. Will the gentleman allow me—

MR. MCKINLEY. Certainly.

MR. SCOTT. I voted for the consideration of the Morrison bill; and my people sent me back here by double my previous majority.

MR. MCKINLEY. I am aware of that; I had not intended to allude to the gentleman at all. A man who has under his control thirty or forty thousand miles of railroad; a man who has coal mines all over

creation; a man who has great plantations down here in Virginia, must be a very weak candidate, indeed, if he cannot come to Congress in an off year on almost any issue. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. I have been a Democrat all my life; and in a Presidential year I was elected to this House in a district which gave Mr. Blaine 6,000 majority, and gave me 900. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I am very glad if the gentleman made the issue on free trade; but if he did, he is the only man in the North who did so. And when he was elected in 1884, he had not voted for the Morrison bill; had you? [addressing Mr. SCOTT.]

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Did you vote for the Morrison bill before 1884?

Mr. SCOTT. I voted for the Morrison bill before my people elected me for my second term.

Mr. MCKINLEY. But you had not done so before being elected the first time.

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir.

Mr. MCKINLEY. You were boasting of the immense majority you had in 1884, when Mr. Blaine was a candidate.

Mr. SCOTT. No. The gentleman from Ohio said that I was elected in an "off year." I replied that I had been a Democrat all my life, and that in a Presidential campaign, when Mr. Blaine carried my district by 6,000 majority, I was elected by a majority of 900; and at the next election, after I had voted for the Morrison bill, I carried the district by double the majority that I had received before. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. What I cannot understand is this: If the gentleman's district believes in free trade and is against protection, how did it happen to give 6,000 majority for Mr. Blaine? [Applause.]

Go back to the people and ask to be returned on this bill and the President's message; do not dodge or equivocate, but stand up to the issue squarely; make your platform in Connecticut the same as in the Carolinas, in New York and New Jersey, the same as Mississippi and Georgia; and then if your majority is returned you will be commissioned to adopt this bill or something like unto it, abandoning the American for the British policy. [Applause.] The details at this time can be of little moment. This bill points to the overthrow of the protective system; that is its tendency and mission.

It is the system which is on trial; not one item or one schedule of the tariff, but the principle upon which the whole rests. Nothing which that side of the House can do or will do touching the tariff can be other than hurtful. If it corrected a single abuse or inequality or incongruity it will be at the expense and sacrifice of many great

interests. It is destruction, not correction you are after. When your bill levels at all it levels down. When it equalizes articles belonging to the same group and family, representing the same raw material and the same amount of labor, its equality is with the lowest. It does not help that which bears the lowest duty, but destroys that which bears the highest. It injures the whole that it may put the whole upon the same footing. It gives no consideration or protection to a single home industry or American product, except probably cotton and rice. It puts no languishing American industry on its feet; it sets in motion no idle spindles; it starts no new fires; it creates no increased demand for labor; if an industry is down it keeps it there; its very breath is paralyzation; it injures what it touches and touches that it may injure. [Great applause.]

If the tariff needs revision—and in some particulars revision would improve it—it must be done by its friends and in full recognition of the principle of protection. It must be done by a party with courage enough to raise duties if needed and reduce them if unnecessarily high, and with wisdom enough to foresee and provide against redundant revenue, and in correcting inequalities, prudent enough to inflict no injury upon any, but bring good to all. That is the correction of inequalities to which the Republican party pledged itself in its national platform of 1884, and for the fulfillment of which it has not since then had a majority in the House to enforce. If it had it would have long ago been done. It will do it when it is again in control. Not correction which destroys, but which makes simple, harmonious, and equitable all of the provisions of the tariff.

It is fortunate that our Government is founded upon the consent of the governed, that every citizen has a voice in making and unmaking the House of Representatives every two years, and even if he is deprived in the interim of a hearing there is one day when he can speak and vote and make his influence felt [applause]; for I tell you, if the workmen were without the ballot we would have free trade within twelve months, and their protests and ours would be as idle as the wind which none of us heed. Fortunately for them they have a vote, and if they fail to use it for their homes and their firesides and their families they will show much less manhood, independence, intelligence, and righteous resentment than I am sure they possess. It was the ballot in the hands of labor to be used next November which kept coal and iron ore from being placed on the free-list in this bill, and unless the majority is reversed in this body and the Fifty-first Congress placed under Republican control these products, with others of equal importance, will be stricken from the dutiable and placed upon the free-list. This is

only the initial step. The chairman of the committee has so declared. Listen to his words found in his opening speech:

We should lay taxes to obtain revenue, but not restrict importations.
* * * We should place every material of manufacture on the free-list. * * *

This is the proclamation made by the premier of this body; this is in direct line with the President's message; this is the plan, the policy, and the purpose of the Democratic party. The elections once safely over, the party now in control again invested with power, and the work will go on to the end. The Democratic patriots and protectionists must get out of the way. Even Democrats who believe that protection is "a local issue," and as such worth maintaining, must not further interrupt the procession. You saw an exhibition of the spirit this morning [laughter], when the generous courtesy of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. Breckinridge] saved his party from a most unfortunate embarrassment. The hope of the country, is in the ballot. The future, and, as I conceive, the welfare and progress of the Republic, the future condition of the wage-earners depends upon the issue to be settled in November. American citizens who love their country must be on guard on that day of supreme concern; it is their day, their one great opportunity. Parties must be subordinated to the great interests of the masses. No party necessity is great enough to force its adherents against its country's best interests. I care not what in the future may be the party name which stands for this system, which stands for the people, I will follow its flag under whatever designation or leadership, because it is my country's flag and represents its greatness and its glory. [Long and continued applause and cries of "Vote!"]

HON. WILLIAM L. WILSON,

OF WEST VIRGINIA.

(Democratic Side.)

It has been said by every gentleman who has spoken against this bill that it raises the issue of free trade or protection in our revenue system. It would disclose a better understanding of its very moderate provisions, as also a better knowledge of the recent fiscal history of the country, to say that it is an effort of the people to recover the lost right of taxing themselves.

The great rule that those who pay taxes, and they alone, should impose taxes may, always and everywhere, be accepted as the test of free government. But after a quarter of a century of protection in this country, private interests are so strongly intrenched in our tariff and have so overgrown public interests, that they regard it as their exclusive domain and resent the intrusion of the people as that of trespassers.

In this tone and in this assumption they speak in their communications to Congress. In this tone and in this assumption they speak through the powerful press they control, and even through their able and enthusiastic advocates on this floor.

Already in this debate gentlemen have explored the census to ascertain how many private interests are represented by the members who framed this bill, in order thereby to test their right and gauge their fitness to deal with a system of general taxation.

But these are not new ideas in this House. Six years ago, when there came from the people such a demand for reduction of burdens that not even a Republican Congress could turn a deaf ear to it, we saw a sight as remarkable as any that could be witnessed in a free government. We saw the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means come into the House, not with a bill to reduce the people's taxes or to stay the unneeded flow of money into the Treasury, but with a set and elaborate argument to prove that the people's Representatives were incapable of framing such a bill.

That Congress responded to his argument. It turned humbly to

the great protected interests enthroned in the tariff and said, "We, who represent nothing but the people, will not presume to deal with your superior rights. We will hand over this whole subject to a commission, and when you have named a majority of that commission, and through it made known your wishes to us, we will do our duty by enacting them into law." But privilege grows with what it feeds upon. It is ever assuming a higher tone. The time was when the test of loyalty to the country was devotion to the Union in the struggle for its preservation. Lately, at the other end of this Capitol, the highest official of a great political party has declared that even a McClellan and a Hancock were allies of the Confederacy because they were disloyal to that party. But in this House and in this debate another test has been set up. We have heard the name of an American citizen, who stands before the world as the foremost living representative of American literature, who has an honorable and unsullied record of public service, and whose words, in days past, were "battles" for freedom—we have heard his name, coupled with that of Benedict Arnold, because he refuses to bow down before the fetich of protection.

My colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows], whose speech naturally gave great satisfaction to his party associates, inveighed with more warmth of language than accuracy of statement against this bill and against the manner of its preparation. Indeed, he was swept so far out on the current of his eloquence from any shore-lines of actual fact, as to proclaim that this bill comes into the House without acknowledged paternity, that it is a bantling, a *nullius filius*, secretly laid at the door of the Committee on Ways and Means, and by the majority of that committee transferred to the Calendar of the House.

The gentleman has no warrant for any such statement. Neither in the committee nor elsewhere, neither now nor at any other time, have the majority members refused to assume whatever responsibility belongs to the preparation and presentation of this bill, from its enacting clause to its closing sentence. They do not offer it to the House as a bill so perfect in all its details that thorough debate and consideration here may not show cause for amendment or change. Least of all do they offer it as a discharge of their full duty to the people, but as the best they could do under existing conditions.

HISTORY OF EXISTING LAW.

When the gentleman from Michigan and his associates seek to discredit this bill because of the alleged manner of its preparation I am

tempted to remind them of the history of the existing law, for whose defense they stand so stoutly to-day.

There was a time, doubtless, when the highest statesmanship was to get money into the Treasury as quickly and as abundantly as possible. There was a time when the highest patriotism was to pay taxes as promptly as possible and ask no questions. Under this pressure an internal-revenue system grew up that in a single year brought over \$300,000,000 into the Treasury. Under this pressure the tariff rates went up from an average of less than 19 per cent. to an average of more than 48 per cent. It would have been strange indeed, contrary to all experience, if the greedy interests that are always seeking a lodgment in a national budget or a national tariff had missed this rare opportunity. That they were fully improving it was well known to those who had charge of the several revisions and increases of the tariff during the war, for they lulled the people with the promise that as soon as peace returned they would revise and establish it on a basis of justice to all.

Yet for years after the war, and as long as the attention of the people was strained to other matter, the tariff was kept open for any interest or industry that wished to become a parasite on the Treasury. Such interests were not only allowed to name the bounties they exacted from the public, but permitted to write the very laws by which their bounties were secured to them.

"I know what that law means," said Mr. Joseph Wharton, testifying before the Tariff Commission in 1882, as to the statute that raised the duty on nickel, of which he was about the only producer in the country, from 15 per cent. ad valorem to 30 cents a pound, "because I wrote the words of it myself." In like manner owners of the copper-mines of Michigan came down and dictated their tariff rates over the veto of President Johnson; and other interests exercised the same privilege without challenge and without hinderance.

But, say gentlemen, "We have had a revision of the tariff since then." What kind of a revision was it? It is true the Tariff Commission in 1882 reported in favor of substantial reduction, and accompanied its report by schedules which professed to reduce from 20 to 25 per cent. I will not inquire into the truth of that profession, for the House threw aside those schedules and attempted to frame a tariff bill of its own. It became lost in the effort; it plunged into the

Serbonian bog,

Where armies whole have sunk,

and finally abandoned the attempt and at the same time its own constitutional right and duty. It took up a tariff bill which the

Senate had attached to a House bill reducing internal revenue. The right of the Senate to originate such a measure is more than doubtful; but constitutional questions could not weigh against the necessity of having the tariff revised by the "friends of protection." The friends of protection in that House were smarting under the lash of popular chastisement. They had already been overthrown at the polls by a verdict of the people so spontaneous and crushing as to evince not only disapproval but even disgust. In a few days more a Democratic House was to succeed them. Whatever was to be done must be done quickly. The standing rules of the House were changed so as to permit the Senate bill to be taken up, not for debate or consideration, but to be thrown into a conference committee. The key to the whole proceedings is found in the fact that a conference committee is a secret conclave. No Democratic Senator was willing to serve upon that conference, and all the conferees, with the exception of one member of the House, who was present to observe, not to participate, were of one party. Into the deliberations of that conference no voice of a tax-paying people could penetrate, but other voices were heard and obeyed. Rates of duty which both Houses had agreed upon were raised. Rates which the two Houses had placed at different figures were increased over both. The duty on steel rails was put higher than the House in open session had dared to place it, higher than the Senate in open session had dared to place it. The conference report was made in the closing hours of the Forty-seventh Congress. The bill was never read in the House, but was slightly debated, and was hurried upon the statute-book as almost the last act of a House going out under the brand of a people's displeasure.

There is all the distance, which even the rich vocabulary of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. Burrows] could measure between a bill prepared in secret, if he will so have it, and then sent out to all the people on the wings of the press and subjected to months of discussion in both Houses of Congress, and a law huddled up in the secret recesses of a conference room and transferred without discussion, and without examination by the people, to the statute-books of the country. [Applause.] And thus, the so-called revision of 1882, instead of being an argument against the present bill, is a burning reason in its favor. It is instructive only as it shows how great a sham and how desperate and audacious a jugglery a revision of the tariff necessarily becomes when committed to the "friends of protection." The effort to reduce taxes became a contest among the captains of industry for higher bounties. The poor, patient, expectant people got no relief. The saddle was adjusted more skillfully to

the back, the girth was tightened, and the rider more firmly seated than ever.

REPUBLICAN BOAST OF REDUCTION.

But the minority of our committee in their report boast that the Republican party has removed more than \$300,000,000 of taxes from the people since the war. That may be true, sir, and still be not the least in the catalogue of sins of that party against the great body of the people. It is true they have reduced taxes; it is true they have abolished taxes; but it has been done in the manner described by my colleague from Texas [Mr. Mills]. They have taken off taxes that bore on the property of the country. They have taken off taxes that tolled the income of the prosperous or the dividends of corporations. They have removed taxes on articles whose use is unnecessary or hurtful, and they have released taxes whose entire amount went into the Treasury. By such legislation in the first ten years of peace, the immense burdens of this great Government were steadily shifted from the shoulders that ought to bear them and are able to bear them to shoulders that ought not to bear them and are not able to bear them. In this manner we have seen the pressure of taxation in this country removed from its income, removed from its property, removed from its luxuries, and fastened upon those articles of general consumption that meet the primary wants of all the people. You have fastened your system of taxation as a parasite upon that consumption which for the wage-earner means nine-tenths and frequently ten-tenths of all his earnings, until you have built up a tariff which is well entitled to say, "Whoever else escapes my exactions, the poor I have always with me." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

There is nothing in the world that so vexes the soul of a genuine protectionist as a tax that goes into the public Treasury. If he cannot devise a law by which to transfer a large part of it from the pockets of the man who earned it to somebody's pockets who did not earn it, he never rests satisfied until he has wiped it from the statute-book [applause]; and that is the way in which our friends on the other side have proceeded in their so-called reductions of taxes since the war.

It is not my purpose to discuss the details of this bill at the present time. That discussion will more properly come at another stage of its consideration. I adopt the language of the President in his recent message, that it is not so much a theory as a condition that confronts us to-day, although I avow myself a believer in the words which old Patrick Henry wrote into the Virginia bill of rights, enjoin-

ing on the servants of the people a "frequent recurrence to first principles." It is a condition of prolonged, excessive taxation; of a surplus flowing into the Treasury which can be gotten out again only by using it to buy the bonds of the Government at the market premium; of a surplus that by the end of the present fiscal year, without such purchase, will drain away from the channels of trade and commerce one-tenth part of all the money usually in circulation among the people.

REPUBLICAN METHODS WITH SURPLUS.

That is the condition which confronts us to-day, and, as in the past, so now there is no statesmanship on the other side of this House that can meet it. Acknowledging an allegiance higher than that which they owe the people in framing a tariff system, they stadd helpless before the great task of tariff reduction. Even in their debates here they are "many men of many minds."

Some would untax the whisky of the drunkard and put heavier taxes on the scanty clothing of his wife and children. Others would give untaxed cigarettes to sap the manhood and drain away the brains of our young men, while they would raise the taxes on the workingman's dinner-pail and the cans that contain his winter fruit and vegetables.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley], after pleasantly alluding to his Democratic associates on the committee as "Bourbons, who neither learn nor forget," by a singular lapse of memory only a few moments afterward announced that he would deal with the surplus "in accordance with the principles of Colbert and of his illustrious disciple, Napoleon Bonaparte."

Why, Colbert was the great minister of the greatest of all the Bourbons, and neither Colbert nor Napoleon is a teacher to whom the citizen of a free republic can turn for instruction either as to laying or expending taxes. It was Colbert, sir, who built up the navy of his royal master by chaining thousands of innocent Frenchmen to the galleys, just as protection has built up privileged classes and monopoly in this country by chaining millions of American workingmen and farmers to its service. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, sir, it was Colbert who defined the art of taxation "to consist in so plucking the goose as to get the largest amount of feathers with the least possible amount of squealing." [Laughter.] Never in the history of economic discussion has there been an apter or a more complete definition of a protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But I assure my friend from Pennsylvania that the goose is squeal-

ing at last, and we mean to keep the goose squealing until every faithless and sleeping sentinel on the Capitol is awakened to drive back the Gauls of monopoly. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

PROPHECIES OF EVIL.

Protection, as it speaks to us from across the aisle, does not reason; it prophesies. I have listened to many of its advocates, and I have heard scant argument and much prophecy. There is nothing original in this. Privilege was never yet summoned to release a tribute paid to it by the people that it did not assume the rôle of Cassandra and prophesy unutterable woes if the industries of the people were released from its grasp and remitted to the laws of trade and the wisdom of Providence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These gentlemen who would blot out the sun, moon, and stars from our industrial firmament if this bill becomes a law might quiet their fears if they would read a few chapters in the economic history of this country and of England.

More than sixty years ago, when England entered upon that career of industrial emancipation which she faithfully pursued to its full and final issue, she began by removing her prohibitory tariff on manufactures of silk and reducing duties. A member of the House of Commons, amid just such ringing applause as greets similar utterances in this debate, said that if the authors of that bill were prepared to sacrifice half a million of people to an abstract theory, their strength of purpose only showed the depravity of their hearts. But the manufacture of silks did not die. In the ratio in which duties were reduced, in that ratio the manufacture grew and flourished, and when finally duties were entirely abolished and it no longer cowered behind a protective tariff, it went boldly forth and contended for the markets of the world. When, as a further step in that progress, the time came for England to put wool on the free-list, there were prophesyings that would stir the envy of the wool politicians of Ohio in our day. It was solemnly foretold that if that measure became a law the wolf and the wild boar would roam unhindered over the hills then dotted with peaceful flocks. But the wool industry refused to die. With free wool it assumed new life and vigor. The price of wool increased and the wages of the shepherd doubled.

But when a little later England was about to declare for untaxed bread for her people, prophecy rose to its highest strain, and declared that the "abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet" was about to blight the green fields and prosperous homes

of England. An English statesman, Sir James Graham, replying to a deputation that pleaded for free corn, said:

If the corn laws were repealed great disaster would come upon the country, The land would go out of cultivation, the church and state could not be upheld; all institutions would be reduced to their primitive elements, and the people we were exciting would pull down our houses about our heads.

But England put corn on the free-list; and agriculture, which with all the doctoring of thirty years of protective statesmanship had languished and weakened, took up its bed and walked—flourished as it had not flourished since the Napoleonic wars. The price of land went up, the farmer prospered, and the wages of the farm-laborer increased.

PROTECTIONISTS FALSIFY OUR HISTORY.

So, also, when the protectionist comes down from the mount of prophecy and attempts to deal with the facts of history (for certainly there are some chapters in our economic history that are made up), he deals with them in the same free and irresponsible manner.

We have had twenty-five years of protection in this country, and the fruits of it. We have had fifteen years of revenue tariff and the fruits of it. The last quarter of a century, as every one knows, has been noted beyond any other period in the history of our race for the general advancement and diffusion of knowledge; for the march of science; for the progress of invention; for the subjection to man's control of the great powers of steam and electricity; for the cheapening of the processes of manufacture, and for the immense increase in the facilities of distribution. Whatever we have gained of ourselves, or in common with other enlightened nations of the world; whatever addition to national wealth or individual comfort has come from this march of progress; from the application of science to the arts and industries, and especially of the science of chemistry, which has become the handmaid of manufactures, which discloses to us the secrets of nature's workshop, dissolves and recombines her elements, and finds in the waste products of manufactures sources of beauty and sources of wealth; whatever the inventive genius of our people has done to substitute labor-saving machinery for human drudgery; whatever of wealth has come to us from our own industry and enterprise, and the settlement of a new continent by men coming from other lands to live under free government; the products of our mines and forests; all these protection calmly claims as its own,

although it has **had** nothing more to do with them than with the motion of the planets or with the tides of the seas. [Applause.]

But those peculiar features in the economic history of our country during the past twenty-five years for which it is just to hold protection fully or partly responsible it conveniently puts aside and ignores.

Professing to be a policy for the making and maintenance of wages, it tells us nothing of the growing antagonism between labor and capital, that has marked the recent history of our country; of the unsatisfactory relations between employer and employed; of the long industrial depressions; of the twenty and odd thousand strikes, and the twenty and odd hundred lockouts in our industrial establishments during the past six years alone, with the resulting loss of \$60,000,000 in wages to labor; of the building up of great wealth by favoritism, which tries to hold on to its privileges by corrupting the ballot-box and intimidating voters; of the centralization of manufactures into a few great corporations, and the recent combination of these into trusts. Of all these we hear nothing in our discussions.

We hear nothing of its compelling Congress for years past to legislate in the presence of an overflowing Treasury until the traditions of frugality which are a part of our institutions are relaxed and our Calendars are filling with schemes for extravagant and useless expenditure. It imposes humiliation upon its most faithful defenders, for it compels the party on the other side of this House, which held control of every branch of the Government for ten years after the war, and again for the period of the Forty-seventh Congress, to admit that in all that time it failed to enact just and liberal pension laws, and that such laws yet remain to be passed.

It seeks to sap the independence and stifle the rising power and willingness of the South to maintain its local schools by offering largesses from the public Treasury.

It seeks to frighten our great cities on the seaboard with three thousand miles of water before them and sixty millions of defenders behind them, to clamor for great fortifications, lest they be laid in ashes by the nightly visit of some ironclad from Chili, Patagonia, Afghanistan, or Beloochistan.

It urges the restoration of our merchant marine, which it has helped to sweep from the seas, by subsidies, that word of evil omen in a republic, contact with which has never failed to bring shame upon Congress and a stain upon our national honor.

Such are some of the fruits of twenty-five years of protection; such are some of the ideas with which it is educating our people; such is the career of profligate expenditure along which it is urging

us in order to escape any reduction of taxes which may work a lessening of its bounties.

Thus, also, when it comes to deal with the fifteen years of our revenue tariff, it does not hesitate to represent the period from 1846 to 1861 as one of languishing industry and halting growth. In so doing it contradicts the most incontestable facts of our industrial history, and it falsifies that careful record which the country itself makes, every ten years, of its own growth and prosperity.

Senator Morrill, of Vermont, whose name is associated with existing tariff systems, in his speech in the Senate on April 11, said:

There is no one who now rises to do reverence to the tariff of 1846.

But Senator Allison, of Iowa, whom his party friends in that State have just put forward with much enthusiasm as their candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, once a leading member of the Committee on Ways and Means in this House, and as well qualified to judge of our revenue legislation as any man in his party, gave it as his deliberate judgment, in a debate in this House March 24, 1874, that—

The tariff of 1846, although professedly and confessedly a revenue tariff, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any we have ever had.

Such I believe will be the judgment of every man who believes that in tariff, as in other legislation, the great interests of the country and the general welfare are to be considered in preference to special interests and individual welfare. [Applause.] Mr. Morrill further said:

It—

Meaning the tariff of 1846—

left manufactures without encouragement and without hope, the wages of labor were reduced, and much capital suddenly destroyed.

But the census of 1860 shows an increase in the decade of the Walker tariff of 90 per cent. in capital, 60 per cent. in wages, and 85 per cent. in product, as against an increase of 32 per cent. in capital, 22 per cent. in wages, and 27 per cent. in product, for the decade ending with the census year 1880, under the present tariff.

Moreover, Mr. Morrill himself, on January 24, 1867, in plain conflict with his recent argument, speaking of the year 1860, said:

And that was a year of as large production and as much general prosperity as any in our history.

It was not after fifteen years of languishing industries and general

bankruptcy that the two sections of this country sprang into the arena of 1861 for the dread grapple of the civil war.

My colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley] used the same argument in his recent speech, and said that twenty-five years of protective tariff lifted the country out of the national bankruptcy into which it had been thrown by the revenue tariffs of 1846 and 1857. I say to him, in the name of a tax-burdened people, in the name of the languishing industries of this country, get out of our sunshine, and let us again plunge into ten years of bankruptcy that will increase the general wealth of the country 126 per cent. [applause]; that will increase manufactures 87 per cent.; that will increase agriculture 95 per cent. [Applause.] We have had no such prosperity since his ideas controlled tariff legislation, and we never will as long as those ideas hold sway in our revenue laws.

WAGES OF LABOR.

I now come to the claim put forward with most earnestness in this debate that the tariff is the defense of American labor, and the one guaranty of good wages and prosperity to the American laboring man. This is an honorable claim and deserves serious consideration. I should deem myself guilty of a flagitious crime if I entertained any views in private or sought to embody any principles in legislation that would harden the lot or impair the opportunities of American labor.

But how do the advocates of high taxation support this claim? Why, they stand up in this House, day after day, and paint in glowing colors, which I am sorry to say do not always portray the real facts, the high estate and happy condition of the American laborer, his good and steady wages and ready accumulation of wealth, and his easy path upward to influence and prosperity; and then they draw with greater exaggeration of detail their gloomy pictures of foreign labor, its degradation, scant wages, and almost unendurable destiny, and exclaim, "Behold what the tariff does for American labor!"

It is true, and I thank God it is true, that the American laboring man is born to a higher and a better destiny than the laboring man of any other country in the world. [Applause.] It is true that we have never yet had a separate wage-earning class in this country. It is true that there is no pressure of ignorance or poverty so great that an ambitious American youth cannot break through and rise to any position to which his worth entitles him. It is true that we see to-day a man who has risen from orphanage and poverty to the Chief

Magistracy of sixty millions of people; that in the past men have so risen from the weaver's loom, the tailor's bench, and the canal-boat; and I rejoice as an American citizen that the same inspiring career is still open to ambition and merit. But they did not owe this to any such antiquated and mediæval device as a protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They owe it to the bounty of Almighty God and to the institutions of a great and free country. [Renewed applause.] They owe it to the manhood, the pluck, the ambition and virtue with which their Creator endowed them and to the unequaled field for their display which the institutions of their country secure them. [Renewed applause.]

I should but follow with limping gait the vigorous and masterly step of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means were I to detain the Committee of the Whole with an attempted discussion of the question of wages. His opening speech embodied a careful and complete discussion of the whole subject. I shall aspire to nothing more than the statement of a few general principles, and their confirmation by an authority or two. Wages are better in America and will remain better in America, not by reason of a protective tariff, or any other kind of a tariff, but because the workingman himself earns more than the laborer of any other country. [Applause.] Some of the reasons for this are that he brings to his work a more vigorous body, a more cheerful and ambitious temper, a higher order of intelligence and of skill, and because he surpasses all other men in his constant efforts to invent labor-helping machinery whereby the products of his labor are indefinitely multiplied. This last is a matter of common observation among ourselves, and of constant wonder to other people. The Superintendent of our last census has said:

The American invents as the Greek chiseled, as the Venetian painted, as the modern Italian sings.

The commissioner-general of the United States at the last Paris exposition reported that the new labor-saving inventions in our machinery gallery "were a constant surprise and delight to the visitors from other lands."

The whole argument on the other side is based on a comparison of daily wages. It is not a question of daily wages, but of the cost of production which is to determine our ability to compete with other nations in our own markets or those of the world. It is not the daily wages of labor, but the productivity of labor, if I may use a word I do not altogether like, that is the vital element in the discussion. American labor, as a rule, is able to produce more, and for that reason does receive more wages than other labor, but this does not

imply that with us the labor cost of production is higher than elsewhere.

Wages have increased in this country, but not in the ratio in which the productive power of labor has increased. These propositions are abundantly confirmed by those who have most thoroughly investigated this subject. I shall cite the testimony of but one or two.

I am aware that it is part of the tactics of our friends on the other side to discredit every man who tries to reach general principles as a theorist and doctrinaire. To attempt to apply general principles in every other field of legislation is commended as statesmanship, but in the great field of taxation it becomes, in their eyes, mere theory and college professorism. There is no gentleman, in my judgment, more entitled to a hearing upon this phase of the wage question than Mr. Edward Atkinson. Mr. Atkinson is a man of almost infinite industry, who to the capacity for gathering the most minute details adds a power of generalization that is broad and masterly. Moreover, he has spent his whole life in immediate contact with the processes of production on a large scale.

It is from the data thus gathered that he exposes the fallacy of the reasoning on the other side, that a comparison of the rate of wages in different countries will ascertain the cost of production of any given article, or that low rates of wages are necessary to low cost of production, and establishes the fact that almost invariably high wages accompany a low cost of production.

That labor—

he says—

has in fact proved to be the cheapest by which the largest product for each dollar expended was assured, and that has been the highest paid labor.

General Francis A. Walker, whose discussions of the wage question are perhaps more satisfactory than those of any of our American economists, confirms Mr. Atkinson by saying:

That as a general rule low cost of production is accompanied by high wages to the workingman.

I have here a little book by Mr. Thomas Brassey, of England, on *Work and Wages*. His conclusions are founded on the experience of his father, the great railroad contractor, who doubtless beyond any man that ever lived was a hirer of labor in all parts of the world except in America, and who even in the unskilled work of building railroads found the English navy as cheap at 3 shillings a day as the East Indian at 3 pence. I quote but a sentence or two:

But I maintain unhesitatingly that the daily wages are no criterion of the actual cost of executing work. * * * On my father's extensive contracts carried on in almost every country of the civilized world and in every quarter of the globe the daily wage of the laborer was fixed at widely different rates; but it was found to be the almost invariable rule that the cost of labor was the same, that for the same sum of money the same amount of work was everywhere performed.

The wages of labor are the laboring man's share of the joint product of labor and capital. The larger that product is the larger his wages are. Why, my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Allen] made a speech in this House yesterday in which, with his usual eloquence, he gave us a beautiful picture of the operatives at Lowell. I venture to say that nine-tenths of the operatives at the Lowell factories are not Americans. They are foreigners who have taken the places of former American operatives, because the American operative has better wages and a better position.

Mr. ALLEN (of Massachusetts). Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN (of Massachusetts). Suppose, for the sake of argument, it is admitted those operatives are not American, and have succeeded in their position as operatives to those of American birth, the statistics will show that the people formerly employed in those factories are now employed in more useful avocations, and have been able, under the protective system, to accumulate sufficient savings while they were employed in those industries to go into other business. The gentleman from West Virginia surely does not object to that. The accumulated savings of those whom the gentleman denominates foreigners aggregate \$14,000,000, almost equal to the aggregate capital employed in those corporations. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON. The very point I was making was that American labor, by its higher capacity, had found more lucrative employment [applause], and that you have been obliged to send abroad into Canada and elsewhere to get labor to fill your factories.

Mr. ALLEN (of Massachusetts). The American operative found that employment under the same protective tariff which has brought the others into this country, as shown by the statistics of the gentleman from West Virginia, and the fact of those people coming in from abroad in large numbers indicates the collective judgment of individuals as to the welfare of this country under a protective tariff.

Mr. WILSON. But if, as my friend from Lowell and the other gen-

tleman from Massachusetts contend, the protective tariff makes wages, what I cannot understand is how a law of Congress should operate so unequally and so unevenly. I have here in my hand an address delivered before the Home Market Club of New England, by Senator Frye, of Maine, on what he saw in Europe, in which, after the good old-fashioned protection logic, he pictures the wretched condition of European labor. Now the Home Market Club is composed largely of gentlemen who derive dividends from the present tariff, and who, naturally, do not want it disturbed.

Mr. MORSE. Exclusively.

Mr. WILSON. The preface of the address has a statement to show "the vast interest New England has in a protective tariff," and it gives the manufacturing statistics of all the New England States except Rhode Island. I do not know why they left her out unless it was because she had a Democratic governor at that time. [Laughter.]

According to this statement here, the capital invested in those five States is \$548,652,118, the number of employees 584,495; but when it comes to wages I find the average wages of an employee in the State of Maine to be \$257 a year, whereas in the State of Massachusetts he gets \$364, and in the little State of Connecticut \$385. Now, what I cannot understand is this: If a tariff, a law of Congress, makes wages, why does it operate so unevenly as between the employé in Maine and the employé in Connecticut, and why is the Main man worth only two-thirds as much as the Connecticut man? And when we come to Vermont, the State of our venerable friend at the other end of the Capitol, I find that the average employé gets only \$303.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON. If a tariff does make wages, then the protective tariff is the most ungrateful thing that ever existed in the history of the world. Why should it give to the fellow-citizen and compatriot of the last Republican candidate for the Presidency only \$257 a year, while it gives to the operative in the good old State that voted for the author of the last Presidential message \$385 a year? And why should it give to the fellow-citizen of the author of the tariff, Mr. Morrill, but \$303 a year? That genial old Senator, who is in the habit of spicing his annual speech on the tariff with delightful scraps of poetry, ought to take as the motto for his next speech—"How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless"—tariff! [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole will be in order.

Mr. WILSON. But the statistics of the Home Market Club

are exactly in line with the figures embraced in the report of the Commissioner of Labor. After careful inquiry into many industries in this country Colonel Wright says that "An examination of these reports will show that there is no such thing as an American rate of wages." For example, in the manufacture of agricultural implements a blacksmith gets 15 per cent. more in Illinois than in Indiana, while a foreman gets 50 per cent. more in Pennsylvania than in New York, and a painter nearly 70 per cent. more in Pennsylvania than in Maine. In the boot and shoe industry a buffer gets \$2.50 in Pennsylvania and only \$1.40 in New York, which would clearly dispose of the Presidential boom of our late esteemed colleague [Mr. Hiscock], did we not find that a button-hole maker in Pennsylvania, if a woman, gets 78 cents, while New York pays \$1.04. When it comes to heelers, New York gives \$2.56 and Massachusetts only \$1.72. But there is still hope for my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Long] for the Presidential nomination, for Massachusetts pays her packers \$1.95 while New York neglects hers with a cold \$1.08.

Mr. WILSON. So when we come to the table of cotton goods we find that Great Britain pays mule-spinners \$1.57, Massachusetts \$1.25, and Vermont only \$1.20, and that the average rate of wages paid in the cotton industry in Great Britain is \$1.17 per day, while in Vermont it is only \$1.15; so that, when Senator Morrill became so alarmed for fear that his fellow-citizens were going to be reduced to the level of the pauper wages in England, it meant simply that they were going to be kicked upstairs from \$1.15 to \$1.17, the average wages in the cotton industry in England.

Mr. WILSON. My venerable colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley], whom I am sorry not to see in his seat, was one of the conference committee in the Forty-seventh Congress which constructed the present tariff. In that committee they put up the duty on iron ore from 50 cents a ton, at which it had been fixed by the Tariff Commission, by the House in open session, and by the Senate in open session, to 75 cents a ton, and all of course in the interest of and for the benefit of the American laboring man.

Now, I have here Pennsylvania Legislative Documents for 1884-'85, volume 2, in which I find the twelfth annual report of the bureau of industrial statistics, by Joel C. McCamant. Speaking of the wages of the iron-ore miners, he says:

The mining of iron-ore does not afford constant employment, the average amounting to but thirty-six weeks per annum. This allows scarcely sufficient wages per week, for the run of the year, to maintain a single individual; how those wage-workers having families to maintain can accomplish that difficult task is a problem in social economics that can be solved only by those who have

been in similar circumstances. Many miners wear belts instead of suspenders to support the weight of their pantaloons; and one of these, in reply to the question asked him relative to his ability to buy food, replied: "Lord bless you, we do not always eat when we are hungry, we just tighten our belts."

[Laughter and applause.]

Now, what has become of the 75 cents a ton which was secured for the American miner of iron ore in that conference? Why, up to that date, May 1, 1885, more than two years afterward, had it not reached him? Is it lost, strayed, or stolen? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Stolen.

Mr. WILSON. I suspect it has found its way into the literary bureau of the American Iron and Steel Association, has been expended in the publication of tracts to prove to the miner what a good thing a protective tariff is for him. [Laughter and applause.] I would say to that philanthropic association, give your miners less tracts and better food under their belts. [Applause.]

DEMAND AND SUPPLY.

But I must must hasten on. I fear I am already speaking beyond all reason. There is one great element in this question of wages that is carefully kept out of view. Gentlemen compare the wages and the condition of the American workman with those of his foreign competitor as if they stood upon an equality in other respects. They ignore the fact that in the labor market, as elsewhere, the law of demand and supply is the great regulator of prices. Where labor has many opportunities for employment wages are high; as these opportunities diminish wages are lessened.

Now, contrast the position of the laborer in these United States with his position in the other countries of the world. The sixty million of people that now inhabit this country are but the vanguard of that mighty host which is destined to find homes, comfort, and prosperity here. Not until the sixty millions become six hundred millions, not until the six hundred millions grow into a thousand millions, will men crowd each other here in the fierce struggle for existence and wealth as they do in Great Britain to-day. [Applause.] And, small as Great Britain is, one-fifth part of the soil of the United Kingdom belongs to her House of Lords. Not one foot of land can her laborer hope to acquire as his own. He is to a large extent a dependent on his employer. When discharged from her factories and mills he may well exclaim, "Me miserable! which way shall I fly?" for a home of his own he can seldom hope to acquire. But the vast territorial extent of our country, the cheap and accessible lands, the

free homesteads—these are the charter of freedom of our laborers against any dependence on any employer. You cannot compel the American workingman to toil for starvation wages as long as these avenues of escape are open to him—and if I were framing an indictment against the party on the other side of this House, I would say that the greatest crime against American labor that could be perpetrated was its taking from the workingman his heritage and the heritage of his children, the homestead offered by the laws of his country, and bestowing it upon railroad corporations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The countries with which gentleman compare us are those of the Old World, crowded with population, burdened with debt, devoured by standing armies, and stratified by social distinctions wrought into their laws or into unyielding customs. Centuries of class government have massed into privileged hands most of their wealth, of their lands, of their honors. Employment is in most cases a boon to the laborer, which he is expected to receive with due humility and thankfulness. Ours is a new country of free men under equal laws. Ours is a country in the making, where enterprise is always alert to achieve wealth and employ labor, where railroads are building—12,000 miles in a single year—cities are springing up; where there are mines to explore, rivers to bridge, mountains to tunnel, forests to fell, and lands to subdue. Everywhere we behold the energy and activity that belong to such an era in the life of a people, with all the demand and opportunity for labor that accompany it, and above all with that genuine respect for labor that is born of equal citizenship.

No other people enjoy the same variety of climate and production, the same freedom of exchange and of movement over a great area. It is unfair, it is unpardonable, it is scarcely less than criminal for the beneficiaries under our tariff system to seek to intimidate the laboring men of this country into a support of their bounties, by telling them that they owe their superior condition not to these natural and moral advantages of their country, but to the protection of the tariff.

THE FARMER.

But, there is one class of our laboring men as to whom these advocates of protection clearly see the difficulty and weakness of their position, and that is the American farmer. Where does the farmer get any benefit from protection? He is the patient beast of burden upon whose broad shoulders you have shifted down the chief burdens of supporting a Government of sixty millions of people, [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Where is the benefit to him under the tariff? My colleague from Michigan [Mr. Burrows] meets the question with the bold reply:

The farmer is not hurt. The consumer does not pay these taxes.

And warming up with indignation because the President had advanced a contrary idea in his message, declared with much emphasis and iteration that it was not true. Why, the merest child who stands behind a store box and sells candy for pins knows that if he does not get as much as it costs him he is in a losing business and will quickly give it up.

The duty that is paid on a foreign article to get it into this country is as much a part of its original cost to the American consumer as the cost of its manufacture or of its ocean freight. No matter who the importer be, foreigner or fellow-citizen, if he does not get that duty back in its sale he is in a losing business, as much as if he failed to get back any other element of cost. Trade stops at once if it brings no profit. Moreover, the amount thus added to its cost by the duty saves the home producer of a like article from having to compete with it at the cost it bore before the duty was added. I commend to the gentlemen on the other side the utterances of some of their party leaders on this point.

Senator Sherman is an active candidate for the Presidency to-day, and I am glad to know that he has a higher idea of the intelligence of the farmer than my friend from Michigan, for he has said in this House:

I said it, and I stand by it, that as a general rule the duties paid upon imports operate as a tax upon the consumer.

Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, in the February number of Harper's Magazine, in replying to Mr. Watterson, argued at length that the larger portion of import duties is borne by the foreign producer; but Senator Edmunds, speaking on the tariff question, January 4, 1883, made a much more correct statement when he said:

In the main all these taxes come out of the consumer, particularly internal-revenue taxes, perhaps all of them substantially.

And I particularly commend to his colleagues on this floor the emphatic language of Senator Plumb, of Kansas, on the 11th January, 1883, spoken with a directness and an earnestness that showed impatience of any contrary suggestion:

Who pays these taxes? When the manufacturer of iron comes to the Senate and says, "I can live, or I can make a profit, if a certain duty is imposed," what is he saying? He is simply saying, "If you give me a certain duty you put it in my power to charge over that duty as an additional tax on the farmers of the United States."

The mere statement of this question, it seems to me, is its conclusive argument, and I should not further refer to it but that the gentleman from Michigan so sharply criticised the President for expressing views like those of Mr. Sherman, Mr. Edmunds, and Mr. Plumb, and in one of his most eloquent periods and with the applause of his party associates exclaimed that the very insensate pen with which the President wrote this folly should have said, "I am cheaper by one-half than before the duty was imposed." And the very midnight oil of which the speech of the gentleman was so redolent might have responded: "I am a thousand per cent. cheaper than I was twenty years ago;" and has a protective tariff done that?

Mr. BAYNE. Oh!

Mr. WILSON. My friend says "Oh!" I can cite the gentleman here to the very paragraph in the New York Tribune where it says coal-oil has come down from 70 cents to 7 cents a gallon.

Mr. BAYNE. How could it be even a hundred per cent. cheaper if it sold for anything at all?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I am beginning at the other end. [Laughter.]

Now, I wish to read a specimen of a protectionist's argument. Senator Frye, in his speech, which the Home Market Club is spending so much money to circulate, says:

We have some wonderful advantages in this country of ours in this matter of manufacturing over any I saw; I believe over any in the wide world. In the first place, we can feed a billion more men on our land than we do to-day, and suffer no harm either.

Then again, we have an enormous seacoast and rivers and lakes which the Almighty planted just exactly right for us to use for our purposes to make cheap freights all over the country. Then again, we have more railroads than all the rest of the world combined, and to-day our freights are cheaper in the United States of America than in any other country on this earth. On our through lines the rates are not one half what they are on the through lines in England. That is a great advantage. Again, we raise our own cotton and a part of England's. We can raise all the cotton the world needs if we please. Texas alone can produce every pound of cotton you use to-day and England purchases from us, and yet not be exhausted at all. Again, we can raise all the wool we need in this country without the slightest difficulty, unless the free-traders get it on the free-list. [Laughter.]

Again, we have iron in twenty-four States and Territories, piled up in mountains now and then, like those in Missouri, with 500,000,000 tons in their bosoms, accessible, more accessible than the iron of any other country.

Again, we have inexhaustible coal-fields, accessible too. Again, we have—for I have seen it—mountains of salt; I saw one in Louisiana where with a pick

you could pick the salt out in blocks. Mountains of sulphur, granite, sandstone, marble, lime-rock, slate, supplies of borax, gold, silver, copper.

Every conceivable thing that we need to make us a great manufacturing nation is spread-out here for our use, ninety one-hundredths of it to-day lying as untouched as when planted there in the earth by the finger of the Almighty. Again—and this meeting here to-night illustrates this—we have the most active, earnest, vigorous business men that are to be found on the earth. Why, abroad they will go to sleep while a man in America is making a fortune [laughter]; open their stores at 10 o'clock, and close them at 4; idle behind the counter, seeking no trade. Again, we have the most ambitious, hopeful, reasonable, intelligent laboring people that are to be found.

We all know that this is substantially true; that it is scarcely an overdrawn picture of the natural and other advantages which the American manufacturer enjoys over those of other countries; and would you not suppose that when he had reached this point in his speech, for very shame he would turn to the millionaires around that banquet-table and say, "Gentlemen, for generations you who possess all these advantages have prevailed on the Government to tax the farmer for your benefit and building up. From his scanty earnings you have been drawing an unearned dividend to insure your prosperity and pile up your wealth. It is time now, under these favorable conditions over your competitors, so much greater than he enjoys, for you to renounce your bounties wrung from his toil, and, thanking him for his long endurance, step down and fight your own battles in the industrial ranks beside him."

But he does nothing of the kind. Like the stag in the fable that was enamored with the beauty of his horns, but at the first sound of the hunter's bugle fled ingloriously away, so Senator Frye, after all these dwelling words and this boasting of the advantages possessed by the members of the Home Market Club, at the first suggestion of a diminution of their bounties, scuds away on cowardly legs and never rests until the "embattled farmers," three ranks deep, stand between him and English competition. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

But, my friends, if this protective tariff is such a good thing for the American farmer, why is he to-day the least prosperous of all American citizens? Why is it that land is going down in all the older States? Why is it that the American farmer, with the best facilities at his command, with all his energy, thrift, and sobriety, is fighting a hard and oftentimes a losing battle?

My friend from Missouri [Mr. Bland] excited some criticism on the other side of the House by his statements as to the mortgages on the farms in this country. I do not wish to make any statement

that is not sustained by the facts, and so I have obtained the last report of the labor bureau of the State of Michigan, which covers an investigation into the mortgages on Michigan farms, and which presents some striking figures. I stand here to-day and say that I have not the slightest doubt that the Michigan farmer is as industrious, as hard-working, as intelligent as the farmer in any other section of the country, and yet this official volume shows that 47.4 of the farm lands in Michigan are covered by mortgages, and that the mortgages are 46.8 per cent. of the assessed valuation of the farms mortgaged. Compare the condition of the unprotected Michigan farmer with the condition of the protected owner of copper mines in Michigan, the latter piling up dividend upon dividend, million upon million, out of the privilege granted him by Congress to tax the people of this country, and the other working early and delving late and piling up mortgage after mortgage upon his estate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILSON. The farmers have neither the time nor the money to come here and besiege Congress about these matters. They are chained to the plow, to their daily labor. They cannot come here to look after their own interest; but the owners of the copper mines, and the other industries that are protected and subsidized, are here at all times in your lobbies urging measures for their own benefit. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if protection is such a good thing for the American farmer, why, I ask again, is the value of American farmlands depreciating? Why is it that in the magnificent Shenandoah Valley, situated between the beautiful Blue Mountains, and so faithfully represented here by my friend before me [Mr. O'Ferrall]—why is it that that valley, with as noble a population as can be found anywhere under the sun, with natural advantages unsurpassed by any section of the country—why is it the people of that valley are fighting a hard and cheerless fight to-day? Why is it, as Mr. David A. Wells tells us in the last number of the Popular Science Monthly, that in New England

Agricultural lands not remote from large centers of population can often be bought for a smaller price than fifty years ago would have been regarded as a fair appraisal, and even less than the cost of the buildings and walls at present upon them?

I have here, to support me, the exact words of Governor Foraker. In his inaugural address, January 1, 1887, he said, referring to the period since the last decennial assessment of real estate in 1880:

There has been a heavy decline. Farm property is from 25 to 50 per cent. cheaper to-day than it then was.

That is good authority for our friends on the other side.

HOME MARKET ARGUMENT.

We have heard on this floor time and again the "old, old story" of the "home market." I have here the great speech made by Mr. Clay in 1832, when he was urging upon the farmers of the country what the opponents of this bill would denounce as free trade, but what he supposed to be a protective tariff. He says, in substance: "I rest the whole case on two grounds." One of these was that the protective system would build up a home demand for the products of the farm, and thus maintain or advance the price of those products.

Whatever force may have been in that argument when used by Mr. Clay is entirely dissipated to-day. Mr. Clay spoke to a country without railroads, without telegraphs. There were no steamships traversing the ocean, no cables under the ocean. He spoke to a country whose farmers, with the exception of those adjacent to its Eastern rivers and seaboard, sought a market for their produce in the nearest town, to which they hauled it in their own wagons; when the value of a bushel of wheat was exhausted by a haul of 300 miles, and that of a bushel of corn by a haul of 100 miles. It was a day when "manufacture" meant something very different from what it means to-day. As late as eight years afterward Mr. Webster described American manufactures as "a little capital mixed with manual labor." At that time the neighboring village or town, with its woolen mill, its hat factory, its shoemakers, its varied industries, was flesh and blood to consume the farmer's products and wear the clothing made from his wool and cotton.

The world has been created anew since Mr. Clay made that speech. To-day we have a railroad system of 150,000 miles, extending into every corner of this country where population or product invites it. To-day we have instantaneous communication with every section of the country, with every portion of the world. You can order a cargo of tea from China and it will be loaded on the ship before night. An order for wheat from Liverpool to San Francisco will outstrip the lagging sun and get there hours before him. You can transfer millions of dollars in the twinkling of an eye from the money market of Calcutta to that of London or New York. The whole world with the construction of railroads, with the building of steam-ships, with the laying of cables has been drawn into one family. The price of the farmer's products is no longer decided in the market of the neighboring village, but in the great market of

the world. The price of the farmer's cotton, his wheat, his meat, and dairy products is no longer decided even in his own country, but by the free, untrammelled competition of the markets of all the world.

During all that time the progress of invention has been displacing human labor by machinery. To-day one man in a factory, and frequently a child, tending some great mechanical invention, produces what in Henry Clay's day would have taken the labor of ten or even twenty men.

In the first annual report of the Bureau of Labor we have some striking illustrations of this displacement of labor by machinery. In a manufactory of agricultural implements 600 hands do the work that formerly required 2,145. In the manufacture of boots and shoes one hand does the work of five, and will produce enough shoes in a year to supply a thousand men. In the manufacture of carpets one hand with the improvements in machinery does the work that required from ten to twenty; in spinning, the work of from seventy-five to one hundred. In the manufacture of some kinds of hats one man is equal to nine. In a large establishment in New Hampshire improved machinery, even in the past ten years, has dispensed with 50 per cent. of human labor in the making of cotton goods. By the use of improvements and inventions in the past ten or fifteen years, in hammers used in the manufacture of steel, there has been a displacement of employes in the proportion of nearly 10 to 1. In the manufacture of paper, a new machine for drying and cutting, run by four men and six women, will do the work of one hundred persons. In the manufacture of wall-paper the displacement has been 100 to 1. Equally striking facts as to the woolen and other industries might be given, but I will call special attention to this general statement. The mechanical industries of the United States carried on by steam and water represent the labor of 21,000,000 men. On our railroads to-day 250,000 men do the work which when Mr. Clay spoke would have required 13,500,000 men and 54,000,000 horses.

To do the work now done by power and power machinery in our mechanical industries and upon our railroads would require men representing a population of 172,500,000 in addition to the present population of 55,000,000.

And it is just in the protected industries of the country, employing altogether, according to the estimate of the late Secretary Manning, not more than 5 per cent. of the labor of the country, that the chief displacement of human labor by machinery has occurred; and yet we all know that while Mr. Clay was willing to compromise

on a tariff of 20 per cent. to protect flesh and blood, the demand to-day is for 47 per cent. to protect machinery! [Applause.]

To-day American manufactures no longer mean as they did to Daniel Webster, manual labor mixed with a little capital. They mean great capital mixed with a little manual labor. Moreover, as our transportation system has been perfected, we have witnessed the gradual disappearance of local manufactures and their massing in immense industrial establishments at particular points. They are to-day sufficient and more than sufficient to supply all the demands of our home consumption, and yet the farmer has to look abroad for purchasers of his surplus products.

Two-thirds of our cotton, nearly one-third of our wheat, immense quantities of other farm products, must be sold to foreigners for lack of home consumers, and yet the argument is daily addressed to the farmer, "Tax yourself still longer to diversify industry and build up purchasers for your products." Our surplus wheat-crop last year would feed thirty millions of people. Is there any device of taxation by which the farmer could build up a home demand for that? You say to the Minnesota farmer, complaining that he gets but 60 cents a bushel for his wheat, "Continue to uphold the tariff; it will start up other industries in your State to buy your wheat." But the farmer, if he is intelligent, knows that there is a cry of over-production from our manufacturers to-day; that we already have more than we can find a market for; and as long as there is free trade among the States of this country there is no taxation to which he can submit that will necessarily bring these industries to Minnesota aside from the natural advantages that would bring them there without such taxation.

But suppose you give him a rolling-mill capable of supplying all the steel rails needed for the railroads of his State, a sugar-refinery capable of supplying all the sugar consumed in his State, and a boot and shoe factory sufficient for the demands of the entire population of Minnesota, there will not be human labor enough in any one of them to consume the wheat-crop of a single large farm. With all the families dependent upon them they would add not one mill to the price of his wheat, and little, if any, to the price of his other products.

So much for the home-market idea. It is but a snare and a delusion to the American farmer. His surplus products sent abroad determine the prices of those he sells at home. Without such foreign market they would sell still lower at home. But to the gentlemen of the Home Market Club of New England the home-market idea is a most solid and profitable reality. It means for them a

population of 60,000,000 shut in by a benevolent Government and forced to buy of them at prices which the Government is seeking to stimulate 47 per cent. higher than they would be if subjected to the same competition under which the farmer sells his staple products.

COMPETITION AND TRUSTS.

But one further remark, and I will relieve the patience of the committee. The other argument used by Mr. Clay was that industries, once established by protection, would gradually, by their free competition among themselves, give to the farmer their products as cheaply as he could buy them elsewhere. Mr. Clay dwelt with much force and variety of illustration on the "beneficent principle of competition," which was to bring the consumer his reward for any temporary sacrifices he was subjected to. He said:

Of all human powers operating on the affairs of mankind none is greater than that of competition. It is action and reaction. It operates between individuals of the same nation and between different nations. It resembles the meeting of the mountain torrent, grooving by its precipitous motion its own channel, and ocean's tide. Unopposed, it sweeps everything before it; but counterpoised, the waters become calm, safe, and regular.

Statesman as Mr. Clay was, he could not look far enough into the future to see that a time might come when the mountain torrent and the ocean tide, instead of opposing their great forces so as to produce this safe and calm counterpoise, would deliberately unite them to sweep all obstructions from their path.

He never dreamed that the great industrial establishments, fostered and built up under a protective system on the implied condition that they would honestly compete among themselves so as to give the cheapest products to those whose bounties had built them up, would combine into the modern trust to despoil and pillage their benefactors. He did not see what George Stephenson early saw, that where combination is possible competition is impossible. All this he did not look forward to, but we are seeing it with our own eyes and suffering it in our own experience. I know that gentlemen on the other side are quite sensitive on this point. I know they are ready to exclaim: "Why, surely you do not mean to argue that these industrial monsters which are springing up on every hand, so full of portent to the welfare of the people and the purity of our Government, are born of our tariff." But that is exactly what I do maintain.

What is a trust? It is a combination, more or less secret and con-

fidential, as its name implies, to form a monopoly for controlling the production or the sale of some article of necessary or general consumption.

There may be a natural monopoly where the supply or production of an article is confined to local limits, as the anthracite-coal fields to Pennsylvania, as the oil fields of this country, in which cases the owners may unite to control supply and regulate prices. There is also an artificial monopoly where the law steps in and confers special privileges on certain parties, whereby they may wholly or largely dictate their own terms to consumers; and this is exactly what our present tariff does.

The Government says to the protected industries, "I will add 47 per cent. to the value of all articles made abroad and thus shield you against competition from without;" and the protected industries are now saying, "Let us combine to shield ourselves against all competition from within. The Government will permit us to sell our products to the people at anything less than the price of like foreign products with 47 per cent. added. Let us see that we come as little below that limit as possible."

I had intended, but for the diversions from my line of remarks, to develop this subject in some detail. I will point to a single specimen, and that a mere infant, a Hercules in the cradle, the great sugar trust, as uncovered by the Committee on Manufactures. Sixteen of our large sugar-refineries, furnishing the bulk of all the sugar consumed in this country, joined in a trust a few months ago, with a capital of \$50,000,000. Almost simultaneously with their combination five of these refineries shut down and cease to produce. One is sold for a city park; another, one of the largest, is to be dismantled. Almost immediately the margin between the price of raw and refined sugars begins to widen. At one time it had reached a cent a pound! When the testimony was taken before the committee it was five-sixteenths of a cent! We consume three thousand million pounds of sugar in this country yearly. One cent a pound above ordinary profits would mean \$30,000,000; five-sixteenths of a cent would mean nearly \$10,000,000.

Similar trusts are springing up constantly in the articles protected by your tariff and beneath its favoring shelter.

I have quite a list here which a friend has gathered from the columns of a single great paper, the New York Times, but I have no time to read them to-day.

Need I dwell upon the effects of such combinations? To the producers of their raw material they dictate prices, for there is but one

purchaser. To the consumers of what they sell they dictate prices, for there is but one seller.

They limit and lessen the demand for labor, for they lessen the supply of their products in order to force up the price in the markets. With the North River refinery in New York turned into a park, and the Oxnard refinery in Brooklyn dismantled, labor is thrown permanently out of employment. It was the misery of banishment from Rome that Rome was the whole world. It is the misery of labor turned out of any one of these refineries that one is all and all is one. If the labor organizations of the country have found it hard to contend with the great corporations standing alone, what will their prospects be when these corporations melt into one? Can we shut our eyes to the influence of such organizations on public morals? Will our legislatures, our judiciary, our ballot-box escape defilement when corporate power and corporate wealth thus grasped by a single and often a hidden hand come to demand special privileges under the law?

I acknowledge the courtesy of the House in extending my time and listening so patiently to my somewhat disconnected remarks. This is a momentous question. None could be more so unless it involved the existence of the nation. It does not take many weeks' service for even the humblest member of the Committee on Ways and Means like myself to get new and sobering ideas as to the greatness of this conflict. When the eyes of the prophet's servant were unsealed he saw camped around the prophet mighty hosts and chariots of fire, invisible to other eyes. So when the servant of the people comes to deal with the tariff question he sees, with a clearness of vision not granted to others, those mighty hosts, the powers of wealth and combination, of monopoly in all its odious and defiant forms, great corporations and monster trusts, all formed in linked phalanx around the protective system. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If he is awed by the greatness of the struggle, he is also nerved by the greatness of the stake. This fight will go on. There will be no industrial peace in this country until our tax laws are fixed upon a basis that is just to all. [Applause.] We will keep the country rocking from ocean to ocean until we have secured just and equal rights before the law for all its citizens.

You may strike down that tribune of the people at the other end of the avenue, who, putting behind him all counsels of prudence, spoke out that ringing summons that rallied the people as nothing else ever did. You may strike down the leaders in this fight as you struck them down in the last Congress and the previous Congress. Those who hold the standard may fall, but other hands

will take it up and move forward. The spirit of our intelligence is behind us. The spirit of liberty is behind us. All we can hope for the future greatness of this country hangs upon the issue; and in the sentiment and somewhat in the words of Mr. Speaker, whoever may falter and whoever may fail, the people of the country mean that its glorious destinies shall be preserved; that they shall be transmitted unimpaired to posterity; that the country shall not belong to monopolists on the one hand or to communists on the other, but shall be as it was designed to be, a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. [Great applause, and cries of "Vote! Vote!"]

HON. JULIUS C. BURROWS,

OF MICHIGAN.

(Republican Side.)

It costs something to maintain a Government for 60,000,000 of people. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that it will require \$326,530,000 to meet the probable obligations of the Government during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1888, and ending June 30, 1889. These liabilities must be discharged. The anticipated income of the Government for the same period from sources other than taxation is as follows:

From sales of public lands.....	\$10,000,000.00
From national banks.....	2,000,000.00
From interest and sinking fund, Pacific railways.....	2,000,000.00
From customs fees, fines, penalties, etc.....	1,150,000.00
From fees consular, letters patent, and lands.....	3,500,000.00
From sales of public property.....	300,000.00
From profits on coinage, assays, etc.....	9,000,000.00
From deposits for surveying public lands.....	150,000.00
From revenues of the District of Columbia.....	2,400,000.00
From miscellaneous sources.....	4,500,000.00

Aggregating the sum of only..... 35,000,000.00

Deducting this amount from the estimated needs of the Government and there will remain \$291,530,000 to be provided for. There are but two ways of raising this sum—one by a loan, the other by taxation. A proposition to borrow in times of peace and reasonable prosperity would excite universal derision. Taxation therefore is the only legitimate recourse. But this is already provided for by law. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that at the present rate of taxation there will flow into the Treasury of the United States during the next fiscal year from—

Internal revenue sources.....	\$120,000,000
Customs.....	228,000,000
Aggregating the sum of.....	348,000,000

an amount in excess of the estimated needs of the Government of \$56,470,000. Fifty-six millions and a half in round numbers, therefore, measures the surplus which will be accumulated in the Treasury during the next fiscal year if the present rate of taxation be continued and the appropriations for governmental expenses shall equal the estimates of the Secretary. It is probable, however, that the full sum of \$326,530,000 will not be appropriated. If the estimates of the Secretary for the next fiscal year are cut to the basis of expenditures for the current year, namely, three hundred and nine millions and a half, the surplus in the Treasury will be increased to seventy-three millions and a half.

Seventy-five millions, therefore, is the fullest measure of the surplus which will be accumulated in the Treasury during the next fiscal year at the present rate of taxation and expenditures. It must be borne in mind, however, that this estimate is based upon the assumption that the Democratic party is to take no thought of the Republic beyond its absolute needs. There is to be no provision for growth, for advancement, for the uplifting of the nation. Our 10,000 miles of seacoast exposed to foreign assault are to remain defenseless. Our Navy and merchant marine is to languish and decay. Fruitful fields, inviting commercial venture and giving promise of enlarged trade, are not to be occupied. Our vast system of internal improvements is to be neglected. The dark shadow of ignorance resting upon the people like a pall, precluding the possibility of good citizenship, is not to be lifted. The full measure of our just obligations to the defenders and preservers of the Republic is not to be discharged. In a word, this calculation is upon the hypothesis that the Democratic party is to use no more money than is necessary to keep the soul and body of the national life together.

Assuming such to be the settled policy of the Democratic party, there will be in the Treasury at the end of the next fiscal year seventy-five millions beyond the requirements for such a purpose.

That the accumulation of such a surplus must be averted there can be no question. A constantly accruing and ever increasing surplus not only invites to profligacy, but insures swift financial disaster. There can be, therefore, no conflict of opinion but that there must be such a modification of our tax laws as will insure a reduction of revenue to the basis of probable governmental expenditure. This would seem to be a problem easily solved, and indeed its

solution would be attended with little difficulty if no other result was to be attained than a reduction of the surplus. In such case it would only be necessary to ascertain the sources of revenue and then cut off indiscriminately sufficient to insure the desired result. But a reduction of the revenue is not the only nor indeed the chief end to be attained. The method by which that reduction is to be accomplished has become the main point of controversy, and, indeed, the only point about which there is any serious conflict of opinion. Shall the proposed reduction be taken from internal or from customs revenues, or from both; and if from both, in what proportion from each? These are the questions of chief concern, and here parties divide and here the conflict begins.

What is the occasion for this division—why this conflict? It is this: We derive our revenues from two sources, internal taxation and a tax on imports. Our tariff on imports is to-day confessedly protective in that it is levied not with a view to raising "revenue only," but to protect American labor and encourage American industries. The Democratic party, or at least one wing of it, under the leadership of President Cleveland, assails this system, denouncing it as "vicious and illogical," and declares it to be not only unwise but unconstitutional; that duties on imports should be levied, in the language of the last national Democratic platform, for "revenue only," submitting of course to such accidental protection as may be incident thereto as an evil to be endured rather than an end to be attained. On the contrary, the Republican party believes in a protective tariff; that in imposing duties upon imports, revenue is not the only consideration, but that these duties should be so adjusted as to give encouragement to American enterprise, investment to American capital, and employment to American labor; and the Republican party insists that our present protective system shall not be disturbed except so far as it may be necessary to correct its incongruities and harmonize its provisions.

With these two conflicting theories it is easy to understand why the contest arises, at the very threshold, upon the method of reduction. If we reduce our revenues by removing or materially lessening internal taxes, our protective system cannot be seriously disturbed; on the contrary, if we follow the lead of the President and secure a reduction by such a revision of the tariff as he proposes, leaving untouched our internal revenues, not only will our protective system be destroyed, but the nation itself will be well out on the highway to free trade. Therefore it is that the free-trader would take as little as possible from internal taxation that he may more successfully assail our protective policy; while the protectionist would

take as much as possible from internal revenues that he may more surely defend it. At the foundation, therefore, of this controversy lies the question of policy which must be first settled before we can come to an intelligent consideration of the committee's bill; and as we are free-traders or protectionists that bill will be approved or condemned.

I propose, therefore, at this time to submit some general observations touching our revenue system, leaving the discussion of the details of the proposed measure to an occasion when their consideration will be immediately in hand. I may pause a moment, however, in passing, to say of this measure as a whole that in its inception and presentation to this House it stands without a parallel in the history of American legislation. Conceived in darkness, brought forth in secrecy—its parentage carefully concealed—it was at last laid at the door of the Committee on Ways and Means [applause], where the majority took it up as tenderly as though it were their legitimate offspring and hurriedly brought the “lump of deformity” into this House, to be adopted by the Democratic party and nursed by the harlot of free trade. [Laughter and applause.] But whatever its parentage, whether British free-trader or the Cobden Club—either of whom are capable of the outrage—justice compels me to state that public suspicion does not attach to any member of the majority [laughter]; and in further vindication of their high character it will be no violation of the secrets of the committee-room to state that, when pressed upon this point, there was no member of the majority so lost to all sense of personal pride as to admit the parentage. [Applause.]

But seriously. Think of the majority of a great committee of this House, charged with the duty of considering an important message of the President of the United States, hiding away from the minority of that committee for six weeks and in some secret place, taking counsel possibly of the enemies of our industries without consultation with the minority, framing a measure involving the industrial prosperity of 60,000,000 of people; and when completed and presented to the full committee, that same majority refusing to enter upon consideration of its provisions or to disclose any data upon which their action was based; stolidly refusing to answer any and every question propounded by the minority touching any portion of the bill; submitting to no modification in a single particular, unless suggested by the majority; declining to listen to any member of this House in behalf of the people he represents; refusing audience to Senators, the industries of whose States were to be crippled or destroyed; rejecting all appeals from manufacturers whose connec-

tion with their industries enabled them to point out the pernicious effects of the proposed measure; refusing to hear one word of protest from the farmer whose flocks and fields are to be despoiled; shutting the door of the committee-room in the face of the laboring men of the country who came to plead for the protection of their homes and their families; imagine, I say, such conduct on the part of a committee of this House and you have a faint conception of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fiftieth Congress. [Applause.]

But to resume the course of my argument. We have to-day a double system of taxation, direct and indirect. Heretofore it has never been the settled policy of the Government to permanently maintain both. A choice of methods was open to the founders of the Republic, and they wisely determined to raise the needed revenue for the support of the Government by imposing a duty on imports. That method has never been suspended. It has undergone modifications, at different times, to conform to party demands, but it has never for an hour been wholly abandoned. It is the approved and established method of providing for the ordinary expenses of the Government. True, direct taxation has sometimes been resorted to to meet unforeseen national emergencies, but heretofore it has always been abandoned so soon as the exigency had passed. Previous to the war of the rebellion direct taxation was invoked only in two instances—first in 1791, to meet the extraordinary demands of a new Government with an empty Treasury and an unestablished credit, and again in 1813, to provide the sinews of war in the second conflict with Great Britain. In both instances, however, direct taxation was abandoned at the earliest moment consistent with nation honor and safety. The law of 1791 remained in force but nine years, and was repealed at the earnest solicitation of President Jefferson, while the act of 1813, after having been on the statute-books but four years, was expunged upon the recommendation of President Monroe.

During the whole period of our national history from 1789 to 1862, nearly three-quarters of a century, not more than \$22,000,000 of our revenues were derived from direct taxation. In 1862, for the third time, we supplemented our customs law by internal taxes, to meet the extraordinary demands of the civil war, and have continued these exactions until the National Treasury is overflowing with a needless surplus. Now for the first time it is proposed to ingraft the system of direct taxation onto the body of our revenue laws, to be permanently maintained, with its army of four thousand officials, at an annual cost to the people of more than \$4,000,000. But I have alluded to this only for the purpose of showing that here-

tofore it has been the settled policy of the Government, under all parties and at all times, to rely entirely upon revenues derived from a tariff on imports, to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government; and that direct taxation has never been resorted to except to meet some unforeseen national emergency, and heretofore promptly abandoned when the emergency had passed. Whatever conflict of opinion, therefore, may now exist touching the abolition or modification of our internal-revenue system of taxation, there can be no question that to supply the needed revenues for the ordinary expenses of the Government by duty on imports has been from the beginning the established policy of the Government.

Yet, in the face of the uniform practice of all parties from the foundation of the Government, the gentleman from Texas criticises the course of the Republican party in this regard. Chagrined at the disclosure made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKinley] in the views of the minority that the Democratic party since 1866, though in control of the House of Representatives eleven years of the time, has reduced taxation only a little over \$6,000,000, while in the eleven years of Republican control we reduced taxation more than \$362,000,000, he seeks to escape the arraignment by criticising the character of our reduction. Seventy-eight million dollars of it came from putting tea and coffee on the free-list, and other modifications of the tariff; \$284,000,000 by removing internal taxes. But these were war taxes, imposed for war purposes, and to have retained them would have been an exaction as unnecessary as it would have been despotic. More than this, to have continued these exactions would have surely overthrown and destroyed our protective system. Let me say to the gentleman that the Republican party is not prepared to substitute direct taxation, with all its inquisitorial methods, for that beneficial policy which, while yielding sufficient revenue, fosters American industries and protects American labor. [Applause.] But I must remind the gentleman that in the reduction of \$6,000,000 by his party they lost sight of the poor man's blanket and the necessities of life and relieved that portion of our fellow-citizens who were staggering under the load of taxed snuff, tobacco, and whisky.

Assuming that the American people will not abandon a policy adopted by the fathers and approved by a century of experience, I come to the consideration of the vital point at issue, namely, upon what articles shall duties be imposed, and to what extent shall they be levied—with regard to revenue only or for the double purpose of revenue and protection? Shall the theories of the free-trader prevail and dominate in the revision of our tariff, or shall it continue to be adjusted not only with a view to revenue but for the promotion

of American interests? This is the question at issue. In this contest the Republican party takes the side of protection and will resist to the uttermost any attempt coming from whatever source it may to cripple American industries, destroy American capital, or pauperize American labor. In adhering to this policy of protection the Republican party can invoke the teachings of the fathers whose patriotism and sagacity laid the foundations of the Republic. The first Congress that assembled under our national Constitution was confronted with an enormous debt, an uncertain credit, and an empty Treasury. Its first duty was to provide sufficient revenue to meet the national demands.

They conceived that in the exercise of the power of taxation and that no less important power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, there were other and higher considerations than the mere requirement of revenue. Smarting under the recollection of the industrial thralldom imposed upon them by the British Government, reflecting upon the impotency of the Confederation to guard and promote the general welfare, they naturally embraced the earliest opportunity under the National Government to devise a plan not only for raising revenue. but for laying the foundations of that industrial independence which in its results has made the Republic the marvel of the world. So it was that having determined to secure the needed revenues by a duty on imports they proceeded to declare that in the imposition of such duties regard should be had not only to revenue but to the development of American industries in the following express terms:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufacture that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc.

Here, then, in the beginning we have the bold avowal of the fathers that duties are to be levied not only for revenue but to encourage and protect American manufactures, which declaration received the support of such illustrious men as Madison, Lee, King, Ellsworth, Ames, Trumbull, and Roger Sherman, and the approval of that most illustrious of Presidents and patriots, George Washington. In the course of debate upon this first tariff measure Fisher Ames said:

I conceive that the present Constitution was dedicated by commercial interest more than any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure

the manufacturing interests and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare.

George Washington, in his annual message to Congress, said:

Congress have repeatedly and not without success directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible.

John Adams, in a special message to Congress, said:

The manufacture of arms within the United States still invites the attention of the National Legislature. At a considerable expense to the public this manufactory has been brought to such a state of maturity as with continued encouragement will supersede the necessity of future importations from foreign countries.

Thomas Jefferson, in his second annual message, said:

To cultivate peace and maintain commerce and navigation in all their lawful enterprises, to foster our fisheries as nurseries to navigation for the nurture of man, and to protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances, these are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves.

In a letter to Benjamin Austin, in 1816, he further said:

We have experienced what we did not then believe that there existed, both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of exchanges with other nations. That to be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place our manufacturers by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is now suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. The grand inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He therefore who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to dependence upon that nation or to be clothed in skins and live like beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say that I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort.

James Madison, in 1809, in a special message to Congress, declared:

The revision of our commercial laws appropriate to adapt them to the arrangement which has taken place with Great Britain will doubtless engage the early attention of Congress. It will be worthy at the same time of their just and provident care to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens.

James Monroe, in his inaugural address in 1817, declared:

Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing as we do all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend in the degree we have done on supplies from other countries. While we are thus dependent the sudden event of war unsought and unexpected cannot fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties. It is important, too, that the capital which nourishes our manufactures should be domestic, as its influence, in that case, instead of exhausting, as it must do in foreign hands, would be felt advantageously on agriculture and on every branch of industry. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials, as by extending the competition it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign markets.

John Quincy Adams, in his fourth annual message to Congress, speaking of the agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests of the nation, said:

All these interests are alike under the protecting power of legislative authority.

Again, on another occasion, he said:

Is the self-protecting energy of this nation so helpless that there exists in the political institutions of our country no power to counteract this foreign legislation that growers of grain must submit to this exclusion from the foreign markets of their products, that the shippers must dismantle their ships, the trade of the North stagnate at the wharves, and the manufacturers starve at their looms, while the whole people shall pay tribute to foreign industry, to be clad in foreign garb; that the Congress of the Union are impotent to restore the balance in favor of native industry destroyed by the statutes of another realm?

Andrew Jackson, in his annual message to Congress, said:

The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely identical with that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the Federal Government. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them, and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case.

In a letter written in 1824 he further said:

Heaven smiled upon us and gave us liberty and independence. The same Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defense. He has filled our mountains and plains with minerals, with lead, iron, and copper, and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the great materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe.

On another occasion he acknowledged the receipt of a home-made hat in the following terms:

A few days since I had the pleasure to receive the grass hat which you had been pleased to present and forward to Mrs. Jackson as a token of the respect and esteem entertained for my public services. Permit me, sir, to return to you my grateful acknowledgment for the honor conferred upon us in this token. Mrs. Jackson will wear with pride a hat made by American hands and made of American materials. Its workmanship, reflecting the highest credit upon the authors, will be regarded as an evidence of the perfection which our domestic manufacturers may hereafter acquire if properly fostered and protected. Upon the success of our manufactures, as the handmaid of agriculture and commerce, depends in a great measure the independence of our country, and I assure you that none can feel more sensibly than I do the necessity of encouraging them.

These citations, from the pen and lips of illustrious statesmen in approval of a protective policy, might be multiplied indefinitely, but with the words of General Garfield I close the recital. In his letter accepting the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1880 he said:

In reference to our custom laws a policy should be pursued which will bring revenues to the Treasury and will enable the labor and capital employed in our great industries to compete fairly in our own markets with the labor and capital of foreign producers. We legislate for the people of the United States and not for the whole world, and it is our glory that the American laborer is more intelligent and better paid than his foreign competitor. Our country cannot be independent unless its people, with their abundant natural resources, possess the requisite skill at any time to clothe, arm, and equip themselves for war, and in time of peace to produce all the necessary implements of labor. It was the manifest intention of the founders of the Government to provide for the common defense, not by standing arms alone, but by raising among the people a greater army of artisans, whose intelligence and skill should powerfully contribute to the safety and glory of the nation.

But this policy of protection has been approved not only by the foremost patriots and statesmen of the Republic, but its wisdom has

been confirmed by a century of national experience. We have tried both systems, a protective tariff and a tariff for revenue only, and I affirm without fear of contradiction, and I appeal to the history of the country in confirmation of the assertion, that the periods of protection in this country have been periods of prosperity and that the eras of free trade or a revenue tariff have been eras of depression and disaster.

We began our national career substantially without manufacturing. During our colonial history it was the policy of the British Government to prevent the establishment of manufacturing industries on this side of the Atlantic. Then as now her insatiate greed knew no restraint but the limit of her power. The policy of the English Government at that time was graphically outlined in an article on "Trade," published in London in 1750, as follows:

Manufactures in our American colonies should be discouraged and prohibited. We ought always to keep a watchful eye over our colonies to restrain them from setting up any of the manufactures which are carried on in Great Britain, and any such attempts should be crushed in the beginning. As they will have the providing rough materials to themselves, so shall we have the manufacturing of them. If any encouragement be given for raising hemp, flax, etc., doubtless they will soon begin manufacturing if not prevented; therefore, to stop the progress of any such manufacture it is proposed that no weaver have the liberty to set up any looms without first registering at an office kept for that purpose; that all slitting mills and engines for drawing wire or weaving stockings be put down; that all negroes be prohibited from weaving either linen or woolen or spinning or combing wool or working in any manufacture of iron further than making it into pig or bar iron; that they also be prohibited from manufacturing hats, stockings, or leather of any kind. This limitation will not abridge the planters of any liberty they now enjoy; on the contrary, they will then turn their attention to farming and raising those rough materials. If we examine into the circumstances of the inhabitants of our plantations and our own it will appear that not one-fourth of their product redounds to their own profit, for out of all that comes here they only carry back clothing and other accommodations for their families, all of which is of the merchandise and manufacture of this kingdom. All these advantages we receive by the plantations, besides the mortgages on the planters' estates and the high interest they pay us, which is very considerable.

It was in this spirit that a manufacturing establishment in South Carolina was by act of Parliament declared a public nuisance and abated; and an English statesman but echoed the dominating voice of British counsels when he declared that the colonies should not be permitted to manufacture a hobnail within their borders.

But the tariff act of July 4, 1789, to which I have alluded, broke

the fetters of commercial thralldom and gave to the nation industrial independence. While the early tariff acts were designed to give encouragement to domestic manufacturing, yet not until 1824 was a measure enacted sufficiently protective to guarantee capital and labor from ruinous foreign competition. Previous to that date our manufacturing industries were of feeble and uncertain growth. True, they received additional stimulus by the embargo of the war of 1812; but no sooner was peace declared than they went down before a flood of foreign importations that swept them into ruin. England, though forced to acknowledge our independence, was determined not to lose her American market, and there was no diplomacy, however questionable, no sacrifice, however onerous, that she did not invoke to retain it. Foreign goods were put upon our market at a loss to the manufacturer, with the deliberate purpose of destroying our industries. Mr. Brougham, in the House of Commons in 1816, made public avowal of such a purpose, declaring:

It was well worth while to incur a loss upon the first exportation in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle those infant manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existence contrary to the natural order of things.

Horace Greeley, giving his personal recollection of this period, said:

My distinct personal recollections of this head go back to the period of industrial derangement, business collapse, and widespread pecuniary ruin which closely followed the close in 1815 of our last war with Great Britain. Peace found this country dotted with furnaces and factories, which had suddenly sprung up under the precarious shelter of embargo and war. These found themselves suddenly exposed to a determined and relentless competition. Great Britain had pushed her fabrics into almost every corner of the world. Of some of these great stocks had nevertheless accumulated, out of fashion and only salable far below cost. These were thrown on our market in a perfect deluge. Our manufactures went down like grain before the mower. Our agriculture and the wages of labor speedily followed. In New England I judge that fully one-quarter of the property went through the sheriff's mill, and the prostration was scarcely less general elsewhere. In New York the principal merchants united (1817) in a memorial to Congress to save our commerce as well as our manufactures from utter ruin by increasing the tariff and prohibiting the sale at auction of imported fabrics.

Henry Clay, speaking in the United States Senate of our industrial condition immediately preceding the tariff of 1824, declared:

If I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present Constitution which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and deso-

lation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824.

But this era of protection was followed by the tariff of 1824 and 1828, which enthused new life into our languishing industries and brought to the country a period of marvelous prosperity. The leading metropolitan journal epitomizes the history of this period as follows:

So soon as the tariff of 1824 went into operation the whole aspect and course of affairs were changed. Activity took the place of sluggishness. Capital was invested; labor came into demand; wages advanced; mines were opened; furnaces built; mills started; shops multiplied; business revived in all its departments. Revenue flowed copiously into the coffers of the Government. The debts created by two expensive wars were entirely paid off. Such a scene of general prosperity had never before been seen by our people.

President Jackson said in his annual message December 4, 1832:

Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity and happiness unequalled in any other portion of the world.

Mr. Clay, in speaking of this era of protection, said:

If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the establishment of their present Constitution it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824.

But unfortunately this era of protection and prosperity was followed by the compromise tariff of 1833, which provided for a gradual reduction of duties until they should reach an average of not to exceed 20 per cent. And what was the effect of this change of policy? Long before that limit had been reached the evidences of its pernicious influence were everywhere visible. Capital invested in industrial enterprises, to save itself from absolute destruction, was withdrawn. Contemplated expansion of business was abandoned, our manufacturers one after another went down under a torrent of foreign importations, while American labor stood idle and empty-handed in presence of the appalling and widespread desolation which culminated in the frightful panic of 1837. And not only the people but the Government itself became so impoverished that the President of the United States was forced into a broker's shop to raise his overdue and unpaid salary. In 1842 the protective system was again invoked, and under its salutary influence our drooping industries revived and prosperity took the place of disaster. The

general effect upon the country of the tariff of 1842 is best described by President Polk in his annual message in 1846:

Labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward, while education, science, and the arts are rapidly enlarging the means of social happiness. The progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extension of our territorial limits or in the rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth and in the happy condition of our people, is without an example in the history of nations.

But this brief period of prosperity was quickly followed by the revenue tariff of 1846 and 1857, which brought to the country another era of industrial depression, culminating in the panic of 1857, the disastrous consequences of which are still within the memory of living men. Universal bankruptcy overtook the people, and the Government with an empty Treasury was forced in times of peace to borrow money at a discount of from 12 to 30 per cent. Then came the era of protection in 1861, which has now been extended over a period of more than a quarter of a century, and who does not know that during these eventful years our industrial advancement has been steady and without a parallel in the history of the Republic?

In spite of the constant and frightful drain upon our resources, incident to and consequent upon a protracted war, we have nevertheless rapidly grown in national strength, until we stand to-day a marvel of industrial development. In 1860 we were without credit at home or abroad; to-day our securities are sought for investments and command a premium everywhere. Then, with an empty national Treasury, we were borrowing money at an exorbitant rate of interest to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government; to-day, with every matured obligation discharged and a Treasury overflowing, we authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to anticipate our obligations. Our manufacturing products have grown from less than \$2,000,000,000 annually to nearly \$7,000,000,000, advancing us from the third to the front rank of the manufacturing nations of the world. Our farm values have increased from a trifle over \$3,000,000,000 in 1860 to more than \$10,000,000,000 in 1880, producing an annual harvest value of more than \$3,000,000,000. In 1860 England boasted of a national wealth as the result of her free-trade policy of \$30,000,000,000, while our aggregate accumulations were only \$16,000,000,000; but during these years of protection, under the most adverse circumstances, we have passed her in the industrial race, and, while she lags behind with only \$12,000,000,000 of accu-

culated wealth, we are the proud possessors of more than \$60,000,000,000.

I submit, therefore, that our protective system comes down to us not only with the recommendation of the fathers, but its wisdom has been confirmed by a century of national experience. A policy of taxation thus doubly sanctioned and confirmed ought not lightly to be abandoned and destroyed; and yet it is proposed by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means to reverse this beneficent policy, and under the advantageous pressure of an overflowing Treasury assail and demolish our protective system. The authors of this measure assure us that it will work a reduction of the revenues \$78,000,000 annually. To accomplish this it is proposed to take only \$24,000,000 from internal taxation and the balance of \$54,000,000 from duties on imports. This reduction of \$54,000,000 on imports is sought to be secured by transferring from the dutiable to the free list a large number of articles, among them wool, lumber, salt, flax, and other products of the farm and factory, upon which a revenue was derived last year of \$22,000,000, and the balance of \$32,000,000 is sought to be obtained by lowering the duties all along the line upon that false theory that in proportion as you lower the duty on imports you will diminish the revenue derived therefrom. These are the three methods employed in this bill to secure the proposed reduction of \$78,000,000. Now, I submit that in taking only \$24,000,000 from internal taxation, while we are collecting annually \$120,000,000 from this source, confirms the public belief that this administration and its supporters are more anxious to assail and impair our protective system than to relieve the Treasury of its plethoric condition. While yielding to the general demand of all parties for a reduction of the surplus they insist that such a result shall be reached only through the methods of free trade. Hence only \$24,000,000 is to be taken from internal taxation while \$54,000,000 is to be secured by a revision of the tariff.

But what is the revision proposed by this bill? First by putting on the free-list articles which last year yielded a revenue of \$22,000,000. Now, all parties agree that anything and everything which is not and cannot be produced in this country, and cannot therefore come in competition with any domestic industry, shall be admitted free of duty. But the free-list in this bill goes far beyond that and exposes to foreign assault many of our most important industries, particularly those of agriculture. There is not a schedule of our tariff it does not invade. The great wool-growing interest of the country, a matter of prime necessity to a civilized people, only in the infancy of its development, capable of producing, if properly

fostered and encouraged, the material for the clothing of all our people, is to be exposed to a ruinous foreign competition which will surely prove its ultimate destruction with all the capital invested therein. The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means in their report on this bill seek to delude the people with the idea that free wool means cheaper wool, and with it cheaper clothing, and that the farmers can well afford to submit to the destruction of sheep-husbandry that they may thereby obtain cheaper woolen goods.

That wool would be cheaper while our foreign rivals were engaged in destroying this domestic industry is quite possible; but when they have completed their work of demolition, when they have driven our flocks to the slaughter-pen and eliminated from our market an annual production of 300,000,000 pounds of domestic wool, we will find ourselves bound, hand and foot, manufacturers and consumers alike, at the mercy of the foreign producer. What restraint then will there be upon his power or cupidity?

What I have said touching this industry will apply with equal force to the main body of the free-list. But I must pass on to the third method proposed, namely, the reduction of rates on the dutiable list, and here we enter the field of speculation. Now, I do not hesitate to affirm that, taking this measure as a whole, no man living, even if a member of the secret cabal that framed it, is audacious enough to predict with any degree of certainty the amount of reduction it will secure. That the \$24,000,000 taken from internal taxation and the \$22,000,000 surrendered by the additions to the free-list will secure a reduction of \$46,000,000 there can be no question. This much is certain.

But whether the further reduction of \$32,000,000 will follow by the lowering of duties is a matter of the vaguest speculation, with the probabilities that such a course will augment rather than diminish the revenues. The natural tendency of such a policy will be to cripple and destroy competing American industries, stimulate importations, and increase the surplus. Such a result is strikingly exemplified in the history of our wool industry in connection with the tariff of 1883. By that act the duty on wool was slightly lowered, and what was the effect? Our flocks and fleeces diminished, importations increased, and our revenue from this source nearly doubled. The number of our sheep fell off from 50,620,626 in 1884 to 44,759,314 in 1887, a net loss of nearly 6,000,000 head in three years, with a corresponding reduction in the wool clip from 308,000,000 pounds in 1884 to 265,000,000 in 1887, a shrinkage of 43,000,000 pounds; while importations rapidly rose from 70,575,000 pounds in 1883 to 129,084,000 pounds in 1886; increasing the revenue in spite of the lowering of

duties from \$3,174,628 in 1883 to \$5,126,108 in 1887. By the act of 1883 duties were lowered on wool, worsteds, knit goods, yarns, wearing apparel, and shoddy and kindred materials, and the revenue derived from the importations of these six articles during the three years following this act were greater by \$11,465,503 than during the three years immediately preceding.

But I have alluded to this in this connection not so much for the purpose of showing the impracticability of the proposed method as to call attention to the fact that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means proposed to take only \$24,000,000 from internal taxation, while a reduction of \$54,000,000 is attempted to be secured by the lowering or total abolition of duties on imports in the interest of foreign rival industries and to the detriment and destruction of our own. This fact alone is sufficient to confirm public apprehension and belief that the Democratic party, or at least the controlling wing of it, while professing an anxiety to relieve the people of unnecessary taxation, is much more anxious to destroy our protective system than to stop the accumulation of a needless surplus. With an easy and open way to a sure and ample reduction of the revenues without disturbing a single American industry or paralyzing a single arm of labor, yet the Democratic party declines to walk therein, preferring that other course, strewn with the wrecks of a nation's experience and fraught with the utmost peril to all our interests and all our people.

But this was to be expected. It is only following the general course commanded by the President in his annual message. True, in the exuberance of his zeal for free trade he advises no modification whatever of our internal-revenue system, but that the entire reduction should be secured by a revision of the tariff which should abolish all duties on some of our most important industries and lower others sufficiently to secure the desired end; but even the free-trade wing of the Democratic party lacked the courage to at once occupy this advanced position. [Applause.] For prudential reasons it seemed advisable to move with greater caution. That the plan of the President and his party, if carried into execution, even as proposed in this bill, would prove disastrous to American industries and American labor cannot be questioned. It is impossible to secure the necessary reduction of revenue by the abolition or lowering of duties without exposing our domestic industries to the most ruinous foreign competition. But the President seeks to allay public apprehension in this regard by declaring that in the execution of this plan care will be taken not to cripple or destroy our manufactures or work "loss of employment to the workingman or the lessening of

his wages." As if his plan could be carried out without working such a result.

As well might the surgeon, having announced his intention to remove the heart of his patient, seek to allay his fears by the assurance that he would not disturb his circulation or impair his physical energies. [Laughter and applause.] One is as preposterous as the other. But the President, and I suppose the authors and advocates of this measure, will endeavor to induce the American people to submit to this suicidal operation by administering some sort of narcotic, which for the moment will dethrone their judgment and make them oblivious to the dangers of the experiment. And here let me say there is nothing so conducive to this state of insensibility as the seductive influence of that theory that a duty on imports is a tax on the consumer. Once induce the people to believe that they are unjustly taxed and there is no political quackery they will not endure which gives promise of relief. Conscious of this fact, the President in his annual message reasserts in the most positive manner that theory, which I had supposed was long since exploded, that a duty imposed upon an imported article by so much enhances the price of such article to the consumer, and that therefore the removal of such duty would proportionately reduce the price. To show that I do not misrepresent the views of the President in this regard I beg to quote the following :

But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty. So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never use and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in

which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people.

I should have thought the insensate pen with which the President wrote that paragraph would have refused to record the error. If it could have spoken it would have said to the President, "The very pen with which you write this folly is cheaper by one-half than before the duty was imposed." [Applause.] But not only in the paragraph quoted is this theory affirmed, but the whole tenor of the message is in harmony with this expressed utterance. The President seems actually to believe that a duty imposed upon an imported article by so much enhances the cost of such article to the consumer, and is therefore a direct tax upon him to the amount of such duty, and therefore that the lessening or removal of such duty would by so much cheapen the article to the purchaser. He affirms with equal confidence that the duty imposed upon an imported article not only raises the price of such foreign article, but at the same time advances in equal degree the price of the entire domestic product, and then to aggravate the seeming injustice we are reminded that while the Treasury is benefited only to the extent of the duty collected, the enhanced price of the domestic product goes into the pocket of the manufacturer to swell his already ill-gotten fortune. This is the substance, the beginning and the end of the President's argument in support of the policy he champions, and I doubt not it will be echoed and re-echoed by every free-trader in the United States, as it has been hailed with unrestrained delight by every free-trader in England.

The gentleman from Texas asserts the same theory, and the whole burden of his speech is based upon the false assumption that a duty is a tax paid by the consumer. He says if the laboring man pays \$10 for a suit of clothes, and a duty of 100 per cent. is added, it advances the price to \$20, which inures to the benefit of the manufacturer, and robs the laborer. I am not surprised that the President should fall into this error, but it is unpardonable in the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

But what answer is to be made to this theory? There is one at least comprehensive and complete. It is not true. I commend to the President his admonition to others, to remember "it is a condition which confronts us, not a theory;" and that condition is an absolute refutation of his theory. [Applause.] It is not true that a protective duty is a tax paid by the consumer. It is not true that a protective duty enhances by so much the price of the article. It is

not true that the duty on the foreign product raises by so much the whole volume of the competing domestic product; and in support of this denial I can summon as unimpeachable witnesses every established manufacturing industry in the United States. Call the roll of your industries, your iron, steel, glass, pottery, the whole array of American industries, and they will bear concurrent testimony to the fact that the duty of which you complain has been the means of reducing the price of their products to the consumer. I challenge any man to name the product of a single well-established American industry that cannot be bought cheaper to-day under our protective system than during any period of our history under free trade or a tariff for revenue only.

Take as an illustration our steel-rail industry, and let us see if the theory of the President is correct. The first Bessemer-steel rail made in this country was in 1865. At that time there was a duty of 45 per cent. on the foreign product, which continued until January 1, 1871, when the act of Congress went into effect which imposed a specific duty of \$28 a ton. In 1867 steel rails were selling in the American market for \$166 a ton in currency, or \$138 in gold. In 1870 the price had fallen to \$106.75, when the duty of \$28 was imposed. Now, if the theory of the President be correct, the imposition of the duty of \$28 would have had the effect of advancing the price by the amount of such duty from \$106.75 a ton to \$134.75. But what in fact was the result? Under the stimulating effect of this protection the product of our steel-rail mills rose from 2,277 tons in 1867 to 2,101,904 tons in 1887, giving investment to millions of capital and employment to thousands of laborers, while the price went down from \$166 a ton in 1867 to \$31.50 in March, 1888. In the light of this example what becomes of the theory that the duty enhances the cost and becomes a tax upon the consumer?

Let me say to the President, "It is a condition that confronts us, not a theory."

Take the case of "blankets," to which the chairman alluded. A pair of 5-pound blankets were recently imported at the lowest possible cost. The statement of the cost, duty paid, is as follows:

Cost in England at wholesale.....	\$4.45
Duty.....	4.25
Customs fees.....	.65
Total.....	9.35

If the theory is true, these blankets ought to sell for \$9.35 a pair; but, as a matter of fact, American blankets of precisely the same

weight and quality were selling at that time for \$5.20. What becomes of the theory that the duty is added to the cost? [Applause.]

But a more forcible illustration, if possible, of the unsoundness of the President's theory is found in the history of a recently established industry in his own State. Previous to 1884 there was not a pound of soda-ash manufactured in the United States. We consume annually 175,000 tons in the manufacture of glass and other American products. Previous to 1884 we imported every pound of it at an average cost of \$48 a ton. A duty of \$5 was imposed, and the Solvay Process Company was organized at Syracuse, the only one on this hemisphere, at a cost of \$1,500,000, with a capacity of 50,000 tons annually. It commenced manufacturing soda-ash in January, 1884. How has it affected the price of this commodity? Was the duty of \$5 added to the \$48, advancing the cost to \$53 a ton? On the contrary, it fell in the American market as low as \$28 a ton in three years, a saving to the people annually of \$20 a ton on the entire consumption of the 175,000 tons, or \$3,500,000. Again I say to the President, "It is a condition that confronts us, not a theory." But I need not multiply instances; they are as numerous as our industries. You cannot touch a manufactured article on the farm or in the home, the product of a protected American industry that has not been made cheaper by reason of such protection. Why, there are many things the market value of which is lower than the duty, and how idle, therefore, to say that the duty is added to the cost. But the difficulty with the President's theory is he forgets that the price of a commodity does not depend upon the rate of duty, but rather upon the great law of supply and demand—a law universal in its application and unvarying in its results. If the supply of a given article be limited and the demand great, the price will be high; and, on the contrary, if the supply be abundant and the demand limited, the price will be low. Therefore it is if by a protective tariff we can establish and maintain a domestic industry which otherwise, by reason of unrestrained foreign competition, could not exist, we will thereby increase the product of such industry and inevitably bring down the price. Alexander Hamilton, nearly a century ago, formulated this law when he said:

But though it were true that the immediate and certain effect of a tariff was an increase of price, it is universally proved that the contrary is the ultimate effect with every successful manufacture. When a domestic manufacture has attained to perfection, and has engaged in the prosecution of it a competitive number of persons, it can be afforded and accordingly seldom or never fails to be sold cheaper, in process of time, than the foreign article for which it is a substitute. The internal competition which takes place soon does away

with everything like monopoly and reduces the price of the article to the minimum of a reasonable profit on the capital employed. This accords with the reason of the thing and with experience.

But further comment is unnecessary to expose the fallacy of the assumption that a duty imposed upon an imported article by so much enhances the cost of such article to the consumer and therefore becomes to that extent a tax upon him.

But the gentleman from Texas, while admitting that wages are higher here than in Europe, denies that it is attributable to our protective tariff. If so, he asks why are not wages uniform throughout the United States? He might as well assert that because manufacturing industries are not equally developed throughout this country therefore their establishment and maintenance is not attributable to our protective system. It is not pretended that a protective tariff, in and of itself, affects wages; but it does build up manufacturing industries, creates a demand for labor, and as a consequence increases its compensation. Wages are not uniform throughout the United States because the cost of production is not uniform. But the gentleman charges that labor is not sharing in the benefits of our protective system. Let me quote from Edward Atkinson, whom the gentleman pronounces "one of the clearest thinkers and writers on political economy of the present day:"

In the judgment of the commissioner of savings-banks and of many others who are competent to form an opinion, at least three-fourths of the present deposits in these banks belong to those who are strictly of the working classes in the limited sense in which those whose daily work is necessary to their daily bread make use of that term. This system of savings-banks is practically limited to New England and the Middle States. The total sum on deposit in all those States is now computed at \$1,100,000,000, at an average of \$356 to each depositor. If the system were extended throughout the country, and the deposit per capita of the people of the United States were equal to that of Massachusetts, the total sum would amount to somewhat over \$8,400,000,000.

Another fact may be cited which fairly sustains the general statement that those who do the actual work of production are now securing to their own use a larger share than ever before of the joint product of labor and capital.

Again this author says:

Wages of mechanics in Massachusetts were 25 per cent. more in 1885 than in 1860, while the purchasing power of money was 26 per cent. greater, and the workingman could either raise his standard of living, or on the same standard save one-third of his wages,

But the chairman of the committee suggests that this protective system is crippling our commerce. He forgets that in 1860, the close of the last period of a low tariff, our exports were only \$336,576,057, and imports \$356,616,119, leaving a balance of trade against us of \$20,040,062. In 1880 our exports had risen to \$835,638,658, and imports \$667,954,746, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of \$167,683,912, an amount one-half as large as our entire export trade in 1860. Our total commerce in 1860 aggregated only \$687,000,000, while in 1880 it reached \$1,500,000,000. [Applause.]

It is an interesting fact that during the period of a low tariff, from 1848 to 1860 inclusive, there was but one year in which the balance of trade was in our favor, and the net balance against us in these thirteen years was \$396,216,161, drawn out of the country in gold to pay for foreign goods. Yet during the last thirteen years, under a protective tariff, only one year has the balance of trade been against us, while the aggregate in our favor has reached the magnificent sum of \$1,612,659,755. [Applause.]

The country will not suffer from changing foreign trade from \$400,000,000 against us to \$1,600,000,000 in our favor.

But the gentleman from Texas, referring to duties on imports, characterizes them as "war taxes;" that they still remain, and that they are heavier to-day than the average during the last five years of the existence of hostilities: that the average rate of duty during the last five years, from 1883 to 1887, inclusive, on dutiable goods amounted to 44.51 per cent., and that during the last year the average duty was 47.10 per cent." It will be observed that the gentleman speaks only of dutiable imports, omitting all imports received free of duty. The average rate on the entire importations he prudently withholds, making his calculation not only misleading, but entirely valueless. To illustrate: The duty of Cognac oil is 533 per cent. If everything else were omitted free of duty—if after the close of the war we had put all else on the free-list—it would be literally true that the average rate on dutiable goods would be 533 per cent., and greater now than during the war, when it was only 31 per cent., but it would convey no idea of the average on our entire importations. [Applause.] We are paying a duty of 134 per cent. on rice in the husks, and if that was the only dutiable article imported it would be exactly true to say that the average rate on dutiable imports was 134 per cent., but the statement would be as valueless as it would be misleading. Yet the gentleman takes the value of our dutiable imports, \$450,325,321, as the basis of his calculation and the duty collected thereon, \$212,632,423, and deduces the average ad valorem rate of 47.10 per cent. for 1887.

But if he had added to the dutiable imports the value of goods admitted free of duty, namely, \$233,930,659, his aggregate of importations for 1887 would be \$683,418,980, which would reduce his average rate to 31 per cent. So the statement that during the last five years, from 1883 to 1887, inclusive, that the average rate on dutiable goods is 44.51 per cent. is true; but if the entire importations are included, the rate will fall to 30 per cent. The same miscalculation destroys the force of his statement that the average rates to-day are heavier than during the war. We have seen that taking our entire imports the average to-day is 31 per cent., while during the war, from 1861 to 1865, the average was 30 per cent. But this average of 1 per cent. higher is attributable largely to lower prices, following the inexorable law that as prices decline the per cent. of ad valorem rates increase. If the value of an imported article be \$10, and the duty \$1, the equivalent ad valorem rate would be 10 per cent. If the value of the same article should fall to \$5, the duty remaining the same, \$1, the equivalent ad valorem rate would be 20 per cent. And so the entire statement of the gentleman is not only misleading and fallacious, but ceases to be interesting or instructive. [Applause.]

But special effort has been made and is being persisted in to induce the American farmer to believe that a protective tariff is hostile to his best interest and his prosperity would be promoted by an abandonment of that policy. How far this effort may be successful it is impossible to forecast; but this much may be affirmed with absolute certainty, unless the results of established law are uncertain and experience is no longer a safe guide, that any course which cripples or destroys our manufacturing interests and deprives labor of its employment therein will seriously disturb and impair the prosperity of our agricultural interests. Andrew Jackson was not mistaken when he said:

Upon the success of our manufactures, as the handmaid of agriculture and commerce, depends, in a great measure, the independence of our country.

Among the advantages conferred upon the farmer by our protective tariff is that derived from a direct protection to the products of his farm and the industries incident thereto as shown by the following table:

Wool at 30 cents a pound or less, 10 cents; at over 30 cents a pound, 12 cents. Beef and pork, 1 cent a pound. Hams and bacon, 2 cents a pound. Butter, 4 cents a pound. Lard, 2 cents a pound. Cheese, 4 cents a pound. Grapes, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Wheat, 20 cents a bushel. Oats, 10 cents a bushel. Corn, 10 cents a bushel. Rye, 15 cents a bushel. Barley, 15 cents

a bushel. Potatoes, 15 cents a bushel. Hay, \$2 a ton. Live animals, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Beeswax, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Vinegar, 10 cents a gallon. Honey, 20 cents a gallon. Fruit, shade, and ornamental trees, shrubs, etc., 20 per cent. ad valorem. All vegetables not otherwise provided for, 10 per cent. ad valorem. Rice cleaned, $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. Wheat flour, 20 per cent ad valorem. Tobacco (unmanufactured), 35 cents per pound. Sugar, $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. Rice flour and rice meal, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Extract of meat, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Barley, pearled or hulled, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound. Barley malt, 20 cents per bushel. Corn meal, 10 cents per bushel. Oat meal, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound. Rye flour, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound. Potato and corn starch, 2 cents per pound. Pickles and sauces not otherwise provided for, 35 per cent. ad valorem. Garden seeds, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Hemp seed, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound. Currants, 1 cent per pound. Apples, 10 per cent. ad valorem. Hops, 8 cents per pound. Milk preserved or condensed, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Flax straw, \$5 a ton. Flax, not dressed, \$20 a ton. Flax, dressed, \$40 a ton. Tow of flax or hemp, \$10 a ton. Bristles, 15 cents a pound. Tallow, 1 cent a pound. Flax-seed or linseed, 20 cents per bushel.

That the farmer should still further be protected in some of these products there can be no question, and yet it is to be observed that the bill now under consideration strikes down with merciless hand many of the most important agricultural interests of the country by placing them on the free-list. When it is remembered that there was brought into this country last year, exclusive of tea, coffee, and sugar, \$57,000,000 of agricultural products in competition with our home interests, the policy proposed by this bill which would still further expose the farmer to foreign competition will not be apt to receive the approval of our agricultural interests. But while this direct protection is of importance to the farmer, the indirect benefits accruing to him from the diversification of our industries are much greater and beyond the possibility of calculation. In this lies the chief advantage. Every farmer tills the soil for a double purpose, first, to supply the necessities for himself and his household, and, secondly, to secure a surplus with which he may obtain those articles of necessity and luxury which cannot be produced from the soil.

For the disposition of this surplus he requires a market, and that market which yields the best returns will be to him the most advantageous. There are but two markets open to him, the home market and the foreign. Can it be possible that the farmer can be deluded into a belief that a policy which destroys his home market and forces him into the distant markets of the world with his surplus products, with all the attending and enormous cost of transportation, will redound to his advantage? Every farmer understands that the nearer

his market to his farm the more abundant his profits. Therefore, any policy which tends to diversify our industries and give employment to a large class of our people outside of agriculture, and who thus become consumers of the surplus products of the farm at home, must inure to the benefit of the American farmer; and any policy which tends to diminish these industries and force the capital and labor employed therein onto the farm, to become producer rather than consumer, must from necessity increase the agricultural product while at the same time lessening the demand therefor. I can conceive of no calamity more appalling than that which would overtake our vast agricultural interests by the destruction of our manufacturing industries and the consequent annihilation of our home market. The importance to agriculture of a diversification of our industries and consequent creation of a home demand for the surplus product of the farm was strikingly set forth by Alexander Hamilton nearly a century ago.

This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil is of the first consequence. It is of all things that which must effectually conduce to a flourishing state of agriculture. To secure such a market there is no other expedient than to promote manufacturing establishments. Manufacturers, who constitute the most numerous class after the cultivators of the land, are for that reason the principal consumers of the surplus of their labor.

But the advantage of such a policy does not rest for its support upon a theory. It is affirmed by experience, and it may be well to again remind the President that "it is a condition that confronts us, not a theory." It is estimated that to-day our population is not less than 60,000,000, of which only 20,000,000 are actually engaged in any gainful occupation, 9,000,000 of whom are engaged in agriculture, leaving 11,000,000 employed in other pursuits. Nine million farmers are feeding a nation of 60,000,000 of people. How does this advantage the farmers? The estimated value of the products of our farms, exclusive of cotton and tobacco, is \$3,000,000,000 annually, and yet 94 per cent. of this enormous product is taken in our own market and consumed by our own people. The farmers are compelled to export only 6 per cent. of their products. In this connection it is worthy of note that while the value of our manufactures reaches the almost fabulous sum of \$7,000,000,000 annually, yet more than 90 per cent. of this is consumed within our borders. It is estimated that the value of our industrial products of farm and factory will aggregate annually \$11,000,000,000, and yet nearly \$10,000,000,000 of this is disposed of in our own market and consumed by our own people. And yet, with a home market of such

absorbing capacity, built up and sustained by a diversification of our industries, the advocates of free trade are constantly holding up the phantom of the markets of the world as the one thing chiefly to be desired.

Of what value to the American farmer are the markets of the world in comparison with his home market? How much of the farmer's surplus products does the world's market require to-day? Before dropping the substance for the shadow it would be well to inquire the extent of the foreign demand for the products of our farm. If a policy is adopted which destroys the home market and forces the American farmers into the markets of the world, when his vessels are laden with the products of his farm, to what ports on the inhabitable globe will he direct his course? Not to South America, nor Asia, nor Africa, nor Australasia, nor the islands of the sea, for in all these there is practically no demand for our agricultural products, and there is no prospect that there ever will be, for these countries are abundantly supplied with agricultural laborers and surplus lands. Europe is the only country which does not feed its own people, and even there Russia, Germany, Turkey, Roumania, Servia, and Hungary produce their own food supply, and excluding Germany, furnish a surplus for the European markets. Outside of Great Britain, therefore, there is practically no demand for our agricultural products, and with the rich fields of India open to her it is not difficult to discern that the time is not far distant when even this demand will cease.

The chairman of the committee, in his recent speech, declared that—

We are the great agricultural people of the world, and have been feeding the people of Europe, and must receive European goods in exchange or fail to export our surplus, and thus surfeit the home market and reduce prices.

This hallucination of feeding the people of Europe is easily dispelled. As bread is the main staff of European life, let us see where it is obtained. The population of Europe is about 350,000,000, and the consumption of wheat about $3\frac{1}{2}$ bushels per head, of which scarcely more than half a bushel is required from North and South America, Asia, and Australasia. In three-fourths of the entire area of Europe the consumption does not amount to 2 bushels per head, and nearly every grain of that is produced at home. On about half of the area of Europe there is a surplus to spare to the other half. The largest consumer of wheat in the world, France, was also the largest producer less than fifteen years ago, and has now about as large an area and product as ever, and needs of foreign wheat only about 10 per cent. of her supply.

The 80,000,000 people of Russia live mostly on rye, as do the people of Germany and Central Europe, and produce it all themselves. Many of the people of the North of Europe consume a large proportion of maize. Some in the North of Europe subsist largely on oat-meal. The consumption of all cereals in Europe usually averages at least 16 bushels per head, of which 3 pecks per capita come from other continents. Feeding the people of Europe ! Four continents combining to supply a per capita deficiency of 3 pecks per capita in the fifth. A failure of one-half peck in this deficiency sends prices rapidly upward ; an excess of one-half peck produces an instant and sudden fall in India and Dakota. An additional half bushel would sprout in the bin or be fed to farm animals without a foreign offer. This is so well known that it would be charity to attribute to ignorance the pretense of enlarging the exportation of wheat by low tariffs, or no tariffs, or by any other device short of the creation of a few million more foreign mouths.

If we do so little in feeding Europe with bread, still less do we supply the meat she consumes. Last year we exported 162,000,000 pounds of beef, fresh and salted ; 138,000,000, or four-fifths of it, went to Great Britain. Very little is ever wanted elsewhere, and Englishmen are now straining every nerve and spending British gold in enterprises to supply their country with frozen and canned beef from Australia and the Argentines. Of 505,000,000 pounds of bacon, pork, and hams exported, 380,000,000 pounds, or three-fourths of it, went to Great Britain and a part of the remainder to Canada. Scarcely a nation in the world, Great Britain excepted, depends upon foreign nations for its meat supply. It is a necessity of their existence that they should supply themselves. It is the same with cheese, the only other food product of which there is an appreciable deficiency in Europe. Its market is confined chiefly to Great Britain, and exportation cannot be enlarged at all without a reduction in price, and any sudden extension is a practical and physical impossibility. The rich there buy all they can eat now, and the poor all they can afford. The requirement is fixed and limited with the least possible element of elasticity, so that the foreign demand can only fluctuate with the annual variations of the home supply. This statement should dispose of the boastful and silly pretense so glibly and frequently made by free-traders, of feeding Europe, and ought to mark the exit of America in the rôle of the world's nurse and caterer to the universe. [Applause.]

Where then on the face of the globe can the American farmer market his surplus ? At home or nowhere. This home market, therefore, should be to him the object of his deepest solicitude and

protecting care, for upon it the future of agriculture in this country depends. I will submit here a table showing the value of the leading products of American farms in 1886, according to estimates of the Department of Agriculture, together with the amount consumed at home and exported, which demonstrates at a glance the importance of the home over the foreign market.

Value of products of American agriculture in 1886, and of the proportion exported in the fiscal year 1886-'87.

Products.	Production, farm value.	Exportation.		
		Export value.	Farm value.	Per cent.
Breadstuffs:				
Corn.....	\$610,311,000	\$20,052,704	\$11,790,046	1.9
Wheat.....	314,226,020	142,666,563	87,668,833	27.9
Oats.....	186,137,930	635,657	343,659	.2
Barley.....	31,840,510	853,405	691,809	2.2
Rye.....	13,181,330	227,971	197,687	1.5
Buckwheat.....	6,465,120			
Rice.....	5,000,000	29,304	26,284	.5
Total.....	1,167,161,910	164,465,504	100,718,318	8.3
Meats.....	748,000,000	78,152,731	62,522,185	8.4
Poultry products...	186,000,000	88,970	71,176
Hides, hair, etc.....	93,000,000	1,101,203	825,902	.9
Dairy products:				
Butter.....	192,000,000	1,983,698	1,487,773	.8
Cheese.....	32,000,000	7,594,633	6,455,438	20.2
Milk.....	156,000,000	258,971	181,279	.1
Total.....	380,000,000	9,837,302	8,124,490	2.1
Textile fibers:				
Cotton.....	257,295,327	206,222,057	177,695,501	69.1
Wool.....	77,000,000	78,002	70,202	.1
Hemp, flax, etc.....	9,000,000		
Total.....	343,295,327	206,300,059	177,965,703	51.8
Vegetables:				
Irish potatoes.....	78,441,940	318,259	238,694	.3
Sweet potatoes.....	20,000,000		
Peas and beans.....	13,800,000	562,864	450,291	3.3
Market gardens.....	68,000,000	427,530	256,518	.4
Fruits.....	175,000,000	2,669,965	1,601,979	.9
Hay.....	353,487,699	218,066	130,804
Tobacco.....	39,082,118	25,637,983	20,510,386	52.5
Hops.....	3,500,000	54,970	46,725	1.3
Sugar and sirup, including honey.....	33,500,000	12,976,061	
Clover and grass seed.....	15,000,000	911,898	638,329	4.3
Wines.....	10,000,000	215,171	129,103	1.3
Totals.....	3,727,218,994	503,938,476	374,220,603	10.0

From this table it will be observed that the American farmer disposes of about 90 per cent., and excluding cotton and tobacco more than 94 per cent., of his farm products at home, and no amount of

sophistry can delude him into the belief that it is for his interest to destroy or lessen this home demand.

His interest lies rather in the direction of an enlargement of our manufacturing industries and a corresponding increase of the number of consumers, that he may ultimately find a home market for the entire product of his farm. Another consideration of incalculable value to the farmer must not be lost sight of, and that is the home market is a permanent and steady one. No business can be profitably prosecuted without some assurance of stability. If the farmer was forced to an entire dependence upon foreign markets for the sale of his products it would be impossible to calculate with any degree of certainty the extent of that demand, dependent as it would be upon the condition of the foreign supply, and the result would be, one year his surplus would find steady and profitable sale and the next perish in his fields. But with a steady market at home, created and sustained by our diversified industries, the demand is steady, and every farmer knows that when he sows he can reap with profit. Another advantage to the American farmer from the establishment and maintenance of manufacturing industries is the enhanced value of his acres. You cannot build up anywhere a prosperous manufacturing industry without enhancing the value of the farm lands adjacent thereto. Cast your eye over the map of the Republic and indicate the localities where industries are the most diversified and the fewest people are engaged in agriculture, and there you will find the highest-priced farm lands. Mark the localities where farming is the chief occupation of the people and other industries are the least developed; there you will find farm lands of the least value. To demonstrate the truth of this assertion I will insert a table in which the States and Territories are divided into four groups, in the first of which is embraced that portion of the country having less than 30 per cent. of the people engaged in agriculture; the second, over 30 and less than 50; the third, over 50 and less than 70, and the fourth having 70 per cent. and over engaged in agriculture:

Classes..	Acres.	Value of farms.	Value per acre.	Per cent. in agriculture.
First	77,250,742	\$2,985,641,197	\$38.65	18
Second.....	112,321,257	3,430,915,767	30.55	42
Third.....	237,873,040	3,218,108,970	18.53	58
Fourth.....	108,636,796	562,430,842	5.18	77

From this table it will be discerned that where 77 per cent. of the people are engaged in agriculture the average value of farm lands is only a trifle over \$5 an acre, while where only 18 per cent. are engaged in agriculture farm lands average over \$38 per acre. What is true in the country at large is equally true in counties and States. The principal manufacturers in Pennsylvania are to be found in thirteen counties, and the average value of farm land within these counties is \$86.73 per acre, while in the remaining counties it is only \$42.02. The farm lands in the twelve chief manufacturing counties of Ohio average \$67.85 per acre, while in the balance of the State they are worth only \$42.46. The farm lands of Ohio, with only 40 per cent. of her people engaged in agriculture, are worth \$46 per acre, while in Kentucky, separated only by the Ohio, but with 62 per cent. engaged in agriculture, they are worth only \$14 per acre. The rugged land of Pennsylvania, with 21 per cent. of her people engaged in agriculture, is worth \$50 per acre, while in Virginia, where 51 per cent. are engaged in agriculture, they are valued at only \$11 an acre. By the census of 1880 in the six States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas 77 per cent. of the people were engaged in agriculture and only 5 per cent. in manufactures, and the average value of the farm lands in these six States was only \$5.18 per acre.

It is an astounding fact derived from the same census that the value of the 200,000,000 acres of farm lands in the eleven States composing the late Confederacy are not equal to the 26,000,000 acres of farm lands in the States of New York and New Jersey. I beg to assure the gentlemen of the South that I have drawn this contrast in no invidious spirit, but only in confirmation of the fact that the development of manufactures tends to enhance the value of agricultural lands. It seems to me, however, that there is a lesson to be drawn from this of inestimable value to you. The South needs this development. Protection has brought it to the North—it will bring it to you. [Applause.] You have but to accept it and it will bring to you an era of unexampled prosperity. It will open and develop your mines, explore your forests, light the fires of your furnaces, build your factories, construct your railways, invite capital to investment, give employment to your labor, plant cities in your waste places, and lead your people into the highway of industrial progress. [Applause.] You have already entered thereon. During the last ninety days \$36,000,000 of capital have gone into your manufacturing industries. In this I rejoice. There is not an industry in the South the development of which would redound to her glory that I would not as jealously guard as though it were the industry of Michigan. I

believe in protection not for my State alone but for my country. [Applause.] I believe in American industries, American capital, American labor, against the whole world.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means expresses the hope that this measure will pass. He is not alone in this desire. There is not a member of the Cobden Club or a free-trader in the United States who is not in sympathy with him. More than this, free-trade England stands on tip-toe of expectation and screams with delight. Listen to the voice of her exultation !

[London Times.]

They are no doubt right in believing that, whatever may be said of preserving the essence of the protective system and of ignoring free trade, the tariff cannot be reduced to the strict proportions of a revenue corresponding to the limited and diminishing necessities of the Federal Government without admitting a great flood of foreign competition.

[London Saturday Review.]

President Cleveland has devoted himself entirely to the tariff. It is impossible to recast this without touching directly the pockets of every citizen of the United States and indirectly influencing the commercial interests of the world.

[London Spectator.]

The message has struck a blow at American protection.

[The Statist.]

There is hardly a single industry in the United States that is not interested in maintaining protective duties.

[London Post.]

We shall be much mistaken if the effect of this state communication will not be to strengthen considerably the case of free-traders in all parts of the world. It will be regarded as a step in the right direction by all who believe in the soundness of free-trade principles.

[London Standard.]

Free trade becomes at once a living issue. †

[London Daily News.]

The stone now set rolling will not stop until it has broken the idol of protection in pieces.

[Glasgow Herald.]

This reads like an extract from some old speech of Mr. Pright's.

[People's Journal, Dundee.]

The change in the American fiscal policy will be beneficial to this country, and the prospect of it has diffused fresh hope throughout the business circles in the city.

[Haddingtonshire Courier, Scotland.]

We may look to an impetus being given to our home trade that will go far to make up for the depression of late years.

[The Scotchman.]

The free importation of iron, coal, and wool would be a great boon to British producers.

[London Times.]

It is to the new world that the Cobden Club is chiefly looking as the most likely sphere for its vigorous foreign policy. It has done what it can in Europe, and it is now turning its eyes westward and bracing itself for the struggle which is to come. It cannot rest while the United States are unsubdued.

I hope this bill will not pass. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] It ought not to pass.

Let me warn you, gentlemen of the South, that this measure bodes no good to you. It will arrest the investment of capital in your midst and bring your industries to a stand-still. There is no portion of our country where this measure should meet with a more united and determined opposition than in the South. Untoward circumstances have heretofore retarded her material progress, but the way is now open for her to march unimpeded to a splendid industrial future. The advance is already sounded. He who does not respond to its inspiring summons will soon find himself without a party and without a following. I rejoice that there is a new South, a new industrial South, born of the throes of war, but full of hope and full of courage. [Applause.] She stands to-day with uplifted brow facing the dawn of a mighty future. Her loins are girt for a new race. With unfettered hands she smites the earth, and fountains of unmeasured wealth gush forth. Beneath her feet she feels the stir of a marvelous life. Her pathway is already illumined with the light of blazing furnaces. Her heavens are aglow with the break of a new day. All hail its on-coming!

“ Aid its dawning tongue and pen,

Aid it, hopes of honest men,

Aid it, paper; aid it, type;

Aid it, for the hour is ripe,

And our earnest must not slacken into play;

Men of thought and men of action clear the way.”

And when the sun shall reach the zenith of that glorious day, the North and the South cemented in the indissoluble bonds of commercial and fraternal unity will stand together under the banner of protection to American industries and American labor, and march to grander industrial triumphs. [Great applause.]

HON. WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

(Democratic Side.)

The bill before the House opens the whole field of tariff discussion, and it is a vast one. Principles settled by the experience of mankind and accepted elsewhere as axioms of science appear to be considered open questions here. So rapid and tremendous are the changes in all the conditions of business, arising from the successive occupations of fresh soils and the unheard-of development of new industries, together with the enormous increase of population, that before accepted principles can be applied to a given situation the situation itself has changed; and your demagogue, with his mouth full of catch-words, insists that your science, though it be ever so true a science, can furnish no solution of a problem or an aggregation of problems which never arose before. I do not agree with the demagogue.

I hold with the statesmen, that political economy is a science; that the true principles of taxation are as definitely ascertained as are any truths not susceptible of mathematical demonstration, and that their application in any country or to any condition will produce approximately the same results. Shall the United States, with their mighty bound of nature and giant industries, shrink from the struggle for possession of the world's markets? Shall we, the teeming Republic of the great West, 60,000,000 strong, with inventive genius keener, with labor more skilled, than any other people on the globe, decline to compete for supremacy in the marts of mankind, and continue forever to trade among ourselves, under the insane delusion that we are growing rich by the process?

Our friends, the enemy, say, "Yes; let us build a Chinese wall around this young and vigorous people, whose eager enterprise already chafes under the bounds of nature, and if we cannot make it wholly impervious let us make it as nearly so as we can. Let us, if we cannot go clear back to the barbarism of China a thousand years

ago, go back at least to the feudal ages, when traffic in almost every important commodity was a monopoly farmed out by the sovereign, and industry and commerce were alternately restricted and plundered under the 'tariff' regulations of rulers extremely solicitous for the interests of the labor which thus furnished the pillage."

They are Bourbons, Bourbons all, and of the densest kind. Their faces are turned backward, not forward; they are looking through the dismal shades of the dead past, not through the glowing day of the living present. Instead of removing the barbarous artificial restraints imposed upon the natural energies of the mass of men by ignorance, rapacity, and tyranny for the benefit of the few, they deliberately propose to reimpose them, to re-enslave commerce, to reshackle labor, and to confine the industries of sixty millions of natural traders by a system, considering the time and the conditions, far more absurd than the Chinese wall.

I have said that this bill and the subject of tariff taxation which it necessarily brings before the House are a vast theme. A very small part of it only can be fairly discussed within the compass of an ordinary speech, and I have therefore deemed it proper to select for examination in detail several of the most important articles upon which existing duties are changed by the committee's bill, using these as illustrative of the whole. But I wish here to say, in the most decisive language I can command, that every alteration of duty effected by this bill has been matured by the majority of the committee with the same equal, conscientious, deliberate, and painstaking care. Nothing has been done in haste; nothing without the most exacting scrutiny. I have personally attended every one of the meetings devoted to the consideration of the bill, with perhaps five exceptions, and every line and word has had from me the most minute attention I was able to bestow. The same, I am sure, can be said of every other member of the majority of the committee. The bill is framed in the interest of the people—of the whole people. We intended in the first instance to stay the mounting surplus in the Treasury, threatening overwhelming and possibly immediate disaster, even now vividly impending; and, second, to relieve, as far as prudence would permit at this time, the overburdened industries of the country from excessive taxation, the proceeds of which do not pass into the Treasury, but go directly to the support of grasping monopolies which are, for the most part, combined in utterly indefensible and atrociously oppressive trusts. If the bill does not measurably accomplish these purposes, it is because the majority of the Ways and Means Committee is incompetent to frame such a law, and of that the country will be the judge.

And this Bourbon, I use the word in no offensive sense, but merely to designate the man who dwells in the political barbarisms of the past and vainly resists the enlightened progress of the present—has a theory all his own, almost as liberal as that of the Chinaman in the time of Confucius, and quite as liberal as that of the potentates of Northern Africa, who blackmailed commerce and called it “tariff.” He says that no matter what this alleged science of political economy may teach, no matter what may be the experience of the rest of mankind, and especially of that obnoxious little island which manages to dominate the trade of the world, everything must necessarily be different here. Though freedom of exchange may produce the most satisfactory results elsewhere, restriction is absolutely essential here. Though elsewhere men thrive by buying cheap and selling dear, it is the reverse here. But his most remarkable assumption is that the true way to advance the interests of the industrial classes is to tax their earnings, not into the public Treasury, but into the private pockets of a favored few, monopolizing American markets under a protective tariff, and regulating both production and price, by that last, most effective, and most terrible expedient in restraint of trade, the irrepressible trust. Now, I agree with my semi-civilized friend, the Bourbon, that our situation is radically different from that of any other people on earth. But the difference does not consist in any exemption from the laws of nature, of trade, or of finance, but in the character of our free institutions, by the genius and theory of which the people are left at liberty each man to pursue his own happiness; that is to say, whatever may be the object of his endeavor, in his own way, and without hinderance by an intermeddling paternal government except where regulation may be imperatively necessary for the safety of the whole. The illustrious Gallatin, for over fifty years a citizen of my own State, the most enlightened financier who has appeared in all American history, third in the great Republican triumvirate—Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin—Secretary of the Treasury eight years under Jefferson and four years under Madison, in that famous memorial of 1832, containing the ripened fruits of his vast experience and profound reflection, said of the alleged protective system in general:

Let it be recollected that the system is in itself an infraction of an essential part of the liberty of the citizen. The necessity must be urgent and palpable which authorizes any government to interfere in the private pursuits of individuals to forbid them to do that which in itself is not criminal, and which every one would most certainly do if not forbidden. Every individual, in every community, without exception, will purchase whatever he may want on the cheapest terms within his reach. The most enthusiastic restrictionist,

the manufacturer most clamorous for special protection, will each individually pursue the same course and prefer any foreign commodity or material to that of domestic origin if the first is cheaper and the law does not forbid him. All men ever have acted, and continue, under any system, to act on the same principle. It is impossible that they should universally act in that manner, unless it was evidently their interest so to do. The tariff system is founded upon the principle that what is true of all men individually is untrue when applied to them collectively. We cannot consider the adherence of enlightened nations to regulations of that description but as the last relic of that system of general restrictions and monopolies which had its origin in barbarous times. If the corn laws are the most odious of those protecting monopolies, it is because they enhance the price of that which is still more essentially necessary than sugar, salt, clothing, or fuel; and we may safely predict that their repeal will be the first result of an improved representation of the people.

We sit here under a written Constitution, exercising only those powers which are expressly granted, and nowhere in that instrument do we find the power to tax for any but a public purpose, and even a tax for a public purpose must be uniform in operation.

I quote the Constitution, as follows:

SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power: 1. To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

I hold:

First. That we have no power to lay a tax which, by excluding the article taxed, defeats the object of taxation, namely, revenue for the economical support of Government.

Second. That we have no power to lay a tax which carries nothing to the Treasury, but which draws money from one man's pockets to put it in the pockets of another. A tax with this avowed object is as manifestly unconstitutional as would be a law taking the life of one man because his existence was inconvenient to another man.

Third. That we have no power out of moneys actually collected and in the Treasury to grant largesses, or to make gifts to any man or class of men, and still less can we by the use of the taxing power constitutionally transfer the earnings of the many to the few.

These are cardinal principles of the Democratic party. When Alexander Hamilton, in the administration of Washington, built up a business aristocracy as an important part of his projected government of corruption and splendor, declared that Congress might indirectly subsidize manufacturing industries at the expense of all others, Mr. Jefferson answered that such a proposition involved the subversion of our whole republican system; that it presented

squarely the question whether we were "to live under a limited or an unlimited government;" whether we were to have a fixed constitution or no constitution; whether the people were to be freemen, left to the free enjoyment of their individual earnings, or to be the slaves of rapacious monopolies, corrupting the legislature and combining to create and to support administrations in the interest of the favored few as against the plundered mass. That question was determined in 1800 by the American people in favor of Jefferson and the Constitution. It has never since been determined otherwise when nakedly presented; and it never will and never can be otherwise determined until we are prepared to abandon our free institutions forever.

A CURIOUS AND DANGEROUS BILL.

In our efforts to meet the situation which confronts us to-day, a dangerous surplus and a necessary reduction of revenue, I will not attempt to discuss whether we should make whisky and beer free as against the proposition to reduce the cost of the necessities of life. A bill has been introduced by a member of this House, and referred to the committee, which provides a large reduction of internal taxes, and deals very curiously indeed with customs duties. At the time of its introduction the Republican press, though opposed to tariff reform, was loud in praise of it as a bill on which all could unite, not only gentlemen on the other side of the House, but gentlemen on this side also, who were supposed to differ with the majority. I cannot believe these anticipations will be realized when this bill is understood, or that any Democrat on this floor could be brought to favor any of its provisions.

It is fair to presume that those who have inconsiderately approved this remarkable bill did not understand its provisions. Covering one hundred and twenty-seven pages, it is too voluminous to be analyzed without great labor. It is impossible in one short view to present a statement of its whole effect or the system on which it was constructed. But taking theiron and steel schedule as a fair index of the genius of the proposed bill, and the one with which the member introducing it is supposed to be most familiar, one which he would naturally desire to conform most nearly to the demands of his immediate constituents or advisers, and passing judgment on the whole from this, it is safe to say it is not in line with revenue reform; not in the interest of the consumer, nor the middleman, nor the manufacturer; in truth and in fact it increases the burdens on every avocation, every industry, the iron-worker as well as the farmer. Taking it item by item, we find this astounding result: That for

every dollar of reduction of duties in the iron schedule, \$26 are added to the burdens of the public, already too onerous to be borne. Instead of reducing taxation, as advised by the Administration; instead of checking the flow of the people's money into a Treasury already dangerously full; instead of relieving a tax-ridden people clamorous for relief; instead of following in line with the declarations of every public officer this Government has ever had, that when we were collecting more money than was needed taxes ought to be reduced,—this bill actually proposes to increase them. Taking the home consumption statement from the Bureau of Statistics, which gives the importations and rates of duty for 1887, it will be found that about sixty-seven items are left by this bill in the iron schedule with rates unchanged; that upon about fifty-six items rates are reduced, and upon about forty items rates are increased. But an examination of the changes discloses the startling fact that the aggregate reductions amount to but \$353,000, while the increase of duties on iron, etc., proposed by the bill aggregates over \$9,000,000. It is not drawn in the interest of the Southern farmer, for among other things raised are cotton-ties, on which the planter is taxed \$158,910 more than before, beside the consequent tribute on those of domestic manufacture. It is not intended to benefit the Western and the Northern farmer, for fence-wire, rods, etc., by this bill are made to pay over a million and a half more than under the present law.

It is not devised to help the suffering consumers of tin-plate, whether it be canners of fruit, meat, fish, or vegetables, or the consumers of canned goods, for they are taxed for the useless can and the implements of cookery, and for the very roof over the kitchen, over \$6,000,000 more than at present. The manufacturer of steel is no better off under the bill, for the duties on imported ingots, from which he makes his product, are raised nearly half a million, while his rails are reduced to \$14 per ton—a cut both ways. In short, this bill benefits nobody and injures everybody. It finds the duties on iron and steel on an average of about 40 per cent., and it raises them by 50 per cent. or to nearly 60 per cent. ad valorem. From whatever point you look at it, it is a mis-begotten, ill-shapen, portentous, unjustifiable monster, with no excuse for existence, and no purpose in its life but to obstruct the Democratic party and to delay the justice which the country demands. [Applause.]

COLONIAL DUTIES.

During this debate I have listened with a great deal of interest to gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have so glowingly referred us to the fact that Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison,

and their compeers were the fathers of protection in this country. The first duties upon imports established by the Colonial Government after our independence were substantially as follows: There were but few articles selected, namely, liquors, sugar, tea, coffee, cocoa, molasses, and pepper. Under the head of liquors, Madeira wine, at that period of our history the beverage of the rich, and Jamaica rum, consumed by the great masses of the people of that day, covered the liquor schedule. Upon Madeira wine was imposed an import duty of twelve-ninetieths of a dollar per gallon; Jamaica rum, four-ninetieths of a dollar; Bohea tea, used by the wealthier classes, six-ninetieths of a dollar per pound; other teas, twenty-four ninetieths of a dollar, the latter being the heaviest tax imposed. Upon all other articles imported 5 per cent. of their value.

After the Constitution of 1789 had been adopted, it was James Madison, of Virginia, who brought into the House of Representatives the first tariff bill, and who urged its passage. He then read the import duties of 1783, added a clause or two on tonnage, and urged the committee to adopt it or at least to make it the basis of a temporary impost. The first proposition was that the mass of goods, wares, and merchandise coming in from foreign ports should be taxed 5 per cent. on their value; but in the list of articles on which special duties were to be laid, the bone of contention appeared to be on Jamaica rum. Two duties were suggested, one of 15 cents and one of 12 cents a gallon, which soon divided the Committee of the Whole. And before this question was settled the debate turned on the good and ill effects of low and high duties; but finally Jamaica rum was taxed at 10 cents a gallon.

When a duty of 8 cents per gallon was proposed on molasses, immediately every member from Massachusetts arose and protested. It was too much; the people would never bear it. They shouted that the capital engaged in the business of distilling rum in Massachusetts out of this molasses summed up half a million of dollars. Yet it was now proposed to destroy this great industry which contributed so much to the prosperity and welfare of the nation, and with such persuasive earnestness did they plead, that the Committee of the Whole consented to lower the duty to $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per gallon. Some articles were thrown out and some were taxed without discussion, but a few gave rise to sharp debates. The greater part of two days was spent wrangling over salt. The bill then under consideration was reported to the House, but wool, and tin in pigs and bars, were on the free-list, and in three weeks thereafter became a law by the approval of President Washington. Under the tariff of 1783 eight articles were specified subject to import duty. The number of arti-

cles named and taxed under the tariff of 1789 did not exceed thirty-two, all others being covered by the 5 per cent. clause. It is this tariff of 1789, introduced by Madison, approved by Hamilton and Jefferson, the average import duties of which did not exceed $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., that the gentlemen on the other side of the House tell us to-day the fathers of the Republic inaugurated, as protectionists, namely, a tariff in which the duties averaged $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ad valorem in 1789, with a bankrupt Government, which could not borrow a dollar, and to-day, one hundred years after, with \$150,000,000 in the Treasury over our wants, the average duty is 47.7 per cent. ad valorem.

What was our policy in 1852 with other nations, when we believed in trading with the outside world? In March, 1852, the United States sent a fleet to compel the Japanese, a great nation numbering 35,000,000 people, to open their ports to the commerce of the world, and the thing was done; and in 1858 a treaty of amity and commerce was signed between the two nations. Regulation 7 of that treaty provides for the following duties on imports into Japan:

Class 1. All articles in this class shall be free.

Class 2. A duty of 5 per cent. shall be paid on the following articles imported into Japan, namely, all building material, rigging, or repairing, or fitting out of ships, whaling gear of all kinds, provisions salted, bread and breadstuffs, living animals, coals, rice, steam machinery, zinc, lead, tin, and raw silk.

Class 3. All intoxicating liquors, a duty of 35 per cent.

Class 4. All other goods, 20 per cent.

And now, should the Japanese station a fleet off San Francisco or New York to demand open, fair, and unrestricted trade with us, in the name of civilization, what answer could we make to them that they might not have made to us?

THE PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT BILL.

The bill under consideration has not been framed entirely upon the principles I have stated. The imajority of the Committee on Ways and Means realize and appreciate the condition of affairs existing in the country to-day; and however desirous they might be to extend that full measure of relief to the wage-worker and the great agricultural classes of the country, to which they are so justly entitled, invested capital has its claims upon them. They appreciate the fact that during the past twenty-five years, under the present system of protected industries, immense sums of money have been invested in the various manufacturing industries of the country, and

that any bill which the committee might introduce should have due regard for the capital invested in such manufactures; that it would be unwise for any great political party having the power to do so to at once attempt to readjust the conditions of to-day, which would undoubtedly cause serious loss to those who had invested their capital under a previous condition of affairs. Keeping these objects in view, we sought, first, to relieve these manufacturing industries by placing on the free-list, as far as we possibly could, such articles as are essentially necessary to them to enable them to compete, not only in their home markets, but in the markets of the world. Secondly, in the revision and readjustment of the various schedules, under the existing tariff, to leave ample duties on all merchandise that could possibly be imported from abroad in competition with our home products, and to protect our home manufacturers and the labor employed by them; and, as the best evidence of our efforts in this direction, I can only compare the average rates of duties under the existing tariff with what they would be under this bill if it should become a law, namely, the average ad valorem duties on dutiable goods under the existing tariff of 47.7 per cent. ad valorem, and the average under the proposed bill of 40 per cent. ad valorem. This shows a reduction under the present bill equal to 7.7 per cent. ad valorem.

On the opposite page is given a tabulated comparison of the difference between existing duties and those proposed under the bill now before the House.

According to this schedule the proposed reduction of duties on imports is.....	\$53,720,447.22
And according to the estimate of Joseph F. Miller, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the reductions of internal revenue under the proposed bill will be.....	24,455,607.00
Or a total reduction of.....	<u>\$78,176,054.22</u>

Of the \$53,720,447.22 reduction of duties on imports under the proposed bill, should it become a law, \$22,189,505.48 are derived from articles placed upon the free-list, leaving the sum of \$31,530,941.74 as the gross reduction made or proposed by the committee, applicable to all our varied industries; and yet the majority of this House and of the committee are charged with being free-traders!

The estimated amount of money that will be in the Treasury of the United States at the end of the present fiscal year, ending June 30, 1888, over and above all liabilities of the Government due at that

Recapitulation and comparison of the duties collected upon imported goods under the existing tariff, with the changes and modifications proposed by the bill under consideration.

Free-list.	Importations of 1887.		Average ad valorem under—	
	Values.	Duties.	Present.	Proposed.
			Per cent.	Per cent.
			27.24	29.00
Wood, salt, hemp, chemicals, metals, etc.....	\$61,672,130.42	\$16,799,450.75		
Wool.....	18,906,987.97	5,390,054.73		
Total free-list.....	79,579,108.39	22,189,505.48	27.78	
Schedules (dutiable).	Importations of 1887.		Estimated—	
	Values.	Duties.	Duties under proposed bill.	Amount of duties remitted.
A. Chemicals.....	\$5,030,325.98	\$2,012,120.51	\$1,133,846.78	\$878,273.73
B. Earthenware and glassware.....	10,492,067.32	6,920,108.16	5,163,820.44	1,756,287.72
C. Metals.....	10,152,789.24	8,450,847.29	6,976,374.70	1,474,472.59
D. Wood and woodenware.....	889,538.56	307,805.13	290,317.95	47,487.18
E. Sugar.....	98,897,102.27	50,515,601.07	45,223,513.73	11,292,087.34
F. Tobacco.....	36,441.00	21,567.00	10,064.60	11,502.40
G. Provisions.....	3,335,987.08	1,711,805.92	1,380,330.92	331,465.00
H. Cotton and cotton goods.....	2,433,585.23	1,233,690.57	935,980.28	277,610.29
I. Hemp, jute, and flax goods.....	17,431,514.05	6,228,310.41	4,185,934.62	2,042,375.79
J. Wool and woolsens.....	42,448,127.04	29,256,442.90	16,925,801.70	12,330,641.20
K. Books, papers, etc.....	57,298.01	13,982.25	10,425.35	3,556.90
L. Sundries.....	11,221,253.04	4,984,536.33	3,905,795.33	1,078,741.00
Total dutiable.....	178,330,048.72	117,063,127.14	86,132,135.40	31,530,941.74
Total free-list.....	79,579,108.39	22,189,505.48		22,189,505.48
Total.....	258,908,157.11	139,252,632.62	86,132,135.40	53,720,447.22
			54.10	33.36
			27.78	48.30

date, is \$150,000,000. Since the Secretary of the Treasury has resumed the purchase of bonds this month (May) the amount offered and purchased daily will not equal even the surplus of the daily taxes collected from the people after paying therefrom the daily expenses of the Government.

The bill now under consideration has been formed for the double purpose of reducing the surplus and relieving the country of needless taxation. The changes made, the majority of the committee believes, will accomplish these objects; but let it be clearly understood that the interests of labor have been steadily held in view at every stage of our proceedings, and we believe that this bill furnishes that protection to labor which our oponents profess to give, but to which their policy is directly opposed. The effect of this bill will be, not to reduce his wages, but to lessen to him the cost of the necessaries of life, and to decrease his dependence upon the employer. Extreme poverty and liberty never exist together. Starving men and women cannot be free. Dependent upon the employer for the opportunity of earning bread, and frequently for the roof over his head, the steadiness of his work dependent, not upon the law of supply and demand, but upon the will of the trust, the employé in protected industries becomes the personal and political slave of his employer. It is the condition of this class, who must necessarily be either a menace to liberty or its bulwark, that the committee has primarily sought to better. Protection, so called, will add no penny to the wage-worker's pay or give one day's additional labor in the year, but it will rob him of an undue proportion of his earnings to purchase the necessaries of life and keep him a trembling dependent, since the recent history of this country shows that the tendency of the protected industries is toward combination in the form of trusts, under which production is arbitrarily suspended, raising prices to the consumer and throwing the workman out of his job. Monopoly more terrible, more dangerous to the liberties of a country, more oppressive to the laborer, cannot be imagined.

This aristocracy, soulless and remorseless, is totally unlike that which exists abroad under the patents of the sovereign. The members of the latter draw their stated incomes from fixed sources and redistribute them among the people in the expenses of their living. But the members of our plutocracy, the plutocracy of subsidy, the monopolizers of American markets, are continually changing, by the operation of their own will, the objects and the volume of the taxation which they levy upon the public, and the proceeds go to swell the fortunes of adventurers, which, when combined together, threaten

the political subjugation of the public. Their exactions are limited only by their desire to take or by the ability of the masses to pay.

THE FARMING CLASS.

In my opinion upon no class of our people do the present fiscal burdens of our country bear so heavily as upon the farming class. It is not in the power of the Government, by any policy that can be adopted, to protect the farmer in what he raises and has to sell; but the Government can impoverish and virtually pauperize him and his family by not only imposing a high duty upon everything he consumes, which is or may be imported, but also by prohibitory duties upon commodities made in this country and necessary to his comfort, which place it in the power of the home manufacturer, by combinations and trusts, to charge what he pleases for his wares. What a mockery of protection the Republican tariff of 1883 is for the farmer! In a speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows], referring to the advantages that the protection theory gave the farmer, he used the following language:

Among the advantages conferred upon the farmer by our protective tariff, is that derived from a direct protection to the products of his farm and the industries incident thereto, as shown by the following table:

(Referring to the duties upon farm products under the existing tariff:) Beef and pork, 1 cent per pound; hams and bacon, 2 cents per pound; butter, 4 cents per pound; lard, 2 cents per pound; cheese, 4 cents per pound; wheat, 20 cents per bushel; oats, 10 cents per bushel; corn, 10 cents per bushel; rye, 15 cents per bushel; live animals, 20 per cent. ad valorem; wheat flour, 20 per cent. ad valorem; corn-meal, 10 cents per bushel.

I claim that not an article named in the foregoing schedule would be imported into this country in competition with the American farmer, if they were all upon the free-list, with the exception of wheat, which could only come from Canada, and if every bushel of wheat raised in Canada should be sold in the United States it would not affect the price of the American wheat one-tenth of 1 cent per bushel [applause], but the country would be the gainer if it were sold here, so far, at least, as the cost of transportation and commissions for storage and selling accrued to our railroads and commission men. The home price of our wheat, corn, beef, pork, butter, lard, and cheese, and of all the products of the farm produced in excess of home consumption, and which have to be exported to Europe to find a market, is determined by the price of the commod-

ity in the markets of the world, plus the cost of transportation. This is beyond controversy.

I will also avail myself of a portion of the tables submitted in the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows] in relation to the farm products of this country, and the quantities exported, for the fiscal year of 1886-'87, as follows:

Products.	Production.	Exportation.		
	Farm value.	Export value.	Farm value.	Per cent.
Breadstuffs:				
Corn.....	\$610,311,000	\$30,052,704	\$11,790,046	1.9
Wheat.....	314,226,020	142,656,563	87,668,833	27.9
Meats.....	748,000,000	78,152,731	62,522,185	8.4
Dairy products:				
Butter.....	192,000,000	1,983,698	1,487,773	.8
Cheese.....	32,000,000	7,594,633	6,455,438	20.2
Textile fabrics: cotton.....	257,295,327	206,222,057	177,895,501	69.1

Why the tariff of 1883 did not contain a duty upon the importation of cotton into this country I do not understand; for, most assuredly, if the duties provided for under the tariff of 1883 gave protection to the products of the Northern farmer, the same theory ought to have given it to the cotton-planter of the South; at least it would be just as consistent, practically applied, when we consider the exportations of the farm products of the whole country.

If the products of our farms could have been sold at home for the one thirty-second part of 1 cent more than the export price, not one pound would have gone abroad; and every pound consumed at home would have been exported if it had commanded abroad one-half of 1 per cent. in value more than the home price; for the home price is governed by the price the surplus exported will command in the foreign markets. One of the strong arguments that the protectionist makes to the farmer is the home market that protection is alleged to insure for his produce. It is a fallacy and a fraud, and intelligent farmers will not be longer deceived by it.

Let us suppose a case in my own State: Let us take, say, the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, located at Braddock, on the Pennsylvania Railroad, 10 miles east from Pittsburgh and 478 miles from Chicago, employing a large number of men. Contiguous to these works lives an industrious farmer with a hundred acres of land. His products consist of wheat, corn, oats, hay, hogs, and cattle. His proximity to these extensive works, where his surplus produce can be delivered in an hour, and where thousands of hungry mouths are ready to consume it, surely gives him an advantageous

market, according to the protectionist's theory. But let us see, let us take one of the products of the farm as an example of the others, for they all come under the same law of supply and demand and price. The man in the iron works cannot eat wheat; it must first be reduced to flour, so the farmer takes a load of $33\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat, just 1 ton, to the miller, who is also on the railroad and near the steel works.

Now, let us see what controls the miller in making a price to the farmer: first, self-interest, to purchase it as cheap as he can; second, to buy the farmer's wheat at a price which after being ground into flour will enable him to sell it to the mill-men in competition with flour sold by the grocery-man at the corner, which has been manufactured at St. Paul or Minneapolis, Minnesota, leaving him (the miller) a margin of profit for grinding and his labor. Surely the miller cannot pay the farmer any more for his wheat because it was raised on land adjoining the steel works; he can only pay what he would pay for the same quality of wheat in the Chicago market, plus the cost of transportation to his mill. The miller explains the situation to the farmer and gets his wheat for that price, or probably less, because the farmer's market is restricted practically to the local mill. But where does Chicago wheat come from? Where is it grown and what law of values determines its selling price? It comes from the great regions of the Northwest; is grown upon the rich and fertile prairies of that section, upon land that can be had almost for the asking, or at most at a cost of from \$3 to \$15 per acre, upon land requiring no barnyard to make a crop, and where the straw is burned in the fields as the easiest and cheapest way of getting rid of it. The price in the Chicago market is determined day by day, if there is not a "corner" in wheat, by the price at Mark Lane, London.

The farmer at Braddock, after selling his wheat, returns to his home and family. He had bought his farm at a cost of \$100 per acre, made a payment in cash upon it, from the savings of years of toil and labor, secured the deferred payments by a mortgage, hoping that by his industry and labor upon his farm and its favorable location he would make money enough to meet the interest and pay off his mortgage at maturity. He has sold his wheat at 90 cents per bushel, grown upon land which cost him \$100 per acre, sown and harvested this wheat by labor for which he had to pay from \$15 to \$18 per month and board, and after the taxes upon the land and his help are paid, and other debts connected with the raising of his crop are settled, he finds that both ends will not meet: that the price he has received for his wheat will not cover cost of production.

Discouraged, but not disheartened, the farmer arises the next

morning before the sun is up; hitches up his team and drives to town. He needs an iron or steel beam for some purpose on his farm, and goes to the steel mill to buy it; and upon asking the price is told that he can have it for 3.3 cents per pound, or at the rate of \$66 per ton; and he is further informed that 3.3 cents per pound for steel beams is the uniform price at all the steel mills in the United States. Now, the farmer protests that 3.3 cents per pound for steel beams appears to him to be an exorbitant price; that his boy works in the steel mill, in the beam department, and that in figuring over the cost of making steel beams last night with his boy they could not make them out to cost more than \$29 or \$30 per ton at the mill; that \$66 per ton gave the steel works a profit of \$36 per ton; and that he thought something must be wrong; what it was he did not just understand, but yesterday he brought into town $33\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat, just one ton, and he could only get 90 cents per bushel for it, or $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, the equivalent of \$30 per ton, and that this price did not pay him the cost of raising it; in fact, he lost money on it instead of making \$36 per ton profit, as the steel works did on the beams, to meet the interest and pay the mortgage on his farm; that he could not understand why he should be obliged to raise and sell 73 bushels of wheat, or over two tons, to enable him to purchase one ton of steel beams, costing less than \$30 per ton to produce and make. The answer of the steel-man was, that this condition of affairs all grew out of the pauper labor of Europe, and the necessity of protecting home labor, and to make a home market for the farmer's wheat, oats, corn, cattle, and hogs. The farmer being unable to refute this unanswerable argument, paid 3.3 cents per pound for his beam and departed a wiser man. In the evening the son returned, and with the father began to discuss the transactions of the last two days, endeavoring to ascertain why the farmer's wheat would only command $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound at the steel works, while the farmer had to pay 3.3 cents per pound for his steel beams. The farmer feared he had made a fatal mistake when he bought the farm; but he had been influenced in the purchase by a speech he had heard in the fall of 1884 delivered by a very distinguished statesman, one Mr. Kelley, at the opera house in Braddock, in which that gentleman ably set forth the advantages of protection to home labor, and eloquently dwelt on the home market it would create for the products of the farm, while enhancing the wages of the mill-hands. But the son could not see the advantage of Mr. Kelley's kind of protection, either to himself, the mill-hand, or his father, the farmer. The price of the latter's product in the home market being regulated by the price in Mark Lane, London, he was of course trading in an open

market, and took nothing whatever by the so-called protection. As to his own wages in the mill, if he got any share of the tariff subsidy in the form of wages, it was so small as to be inappreciable and to count for practically nothing as against the prices he was made to pay for the "tariffed" necessities of life; but considering the employer's share, and the necessities of a "protected" employer's life, he was not so surprised that the "boss," as alleged in the newspapers, could rent Cluny Castle, in Inverness-shire, Scotland, to spend his summers in; and as he believed that the net profits of Carnegie Brothers on the two items of steel rails and steel beams alone, throwing out of account all other items of their production, were, on 30,000 tons of steel beams, \$1,000,000, and on 192,998 tons of steel rails, at \$10 per ton, \$1,929,980, or a total profit on these two items alone of nearly \$3,000,000, the son, with an eye to facts and figures, declared his extreme amazement at the proposition of Carnegie Brothers to reduce wages 10 per cent., for the wage-workers of that establishment thought they might decently leave this pitiful percentage in the hands of that labor in whose name and for whose alleged benefit they receive the enormous bounty extorted from the consumers of the United States upon those two capital articles; and that while the employés not only thought they were justly entitled to this 10 per cent., they were yet fighting for a principle dearer to them than mere dollars and cents. It was a principle involving not only the great economic problem of this age, but of past ages, and must be the great problem of the future—a fair division between labor and capital; and if the wage-worker at Carnegie Brothers' works could be forced into subjugation by Pinkerton special detectives, their just rights denied them, and the imported pauper labor of Europe could be utilized as a means for the subversion of their rights, he could see very little hope in the future for the wage-worker in this country.

IRON AND STEEL, AND THE EDGAR THOMSON STEEL WORKS.

I propose, if I can, to prove that the boy's conclusions in regard to his own wages are correct. In 1886 Hon. Daniel Manning, then Secretary of the Treasury, issued circulars to the various manufacturing industries of the country, asking them for certain information in regard to the cost of manufacturing, including labor and material, the object of the circular being to gather together certain data to lay before Congress in connection with a revision of the tariff. Among others to whom this circular was sent was the "American Iron and Steel Association," with offices at Philadelphia—an association representing, I may say, the entire iron and steel industry of this country.

This association sent out to the various manufacturing industries that formed the association a circular letter, asking that the information desired by the Secretary of the Treasury should be reported to them, and that they would forward it to the Department. Among the replies received by the association was the following communication from Thomas M. Carnegie, chairman of Carnegie Brothers & Co., Limited, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Notwithstanding your able argument in favor of reporting details of cost of production of iron and steel, as requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, and in a less objectionable form by yourself, I am of the opinion that our interest would not be served by making such returns as you indicate. (See page 373, Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on revision of the tariff, with accompanying documents, 1886.)

I am prepared to supply a portion of the information desired by the Department, and which Carnegie Brothers & Co., Limited, declined to give, taken from their own books.

I hold in my hand a copy of a contract, executed under seal, which I saw copied from the original myself, of the schedule of wages as awarded by the board of arbitration, selected by the Knights of Labor and the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, fixing the wages of the employés of that company in the steel-mill department for the year 1887; and from this contract I submit a statement based upon the absolute amount of money paid to these employés in connection with the steel-rail department of that company. They are not theoretical figures; they are the absolute results in dollars and cents, and fully and clearly set forth the earnings of the wage-workers working in that company.

STEEL RAILS.

Under the terms and conditions of this contract the following is the cost of manufacturing a ton of steel rails, of 2,240 pounds, at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, located near Pittsburgh, Pa., during the year 1887, one of the largest establishments of the kind in the United States:

Market price of 1 ton of No. 1 Bessemer pig-iron at the mill.....	\$18.00
Converting same, per ton.....	1.50
Blooming, per ton.....	.72
Finishing, per ton.....	1.87
1½ tons Connellsville coke, average \$1.35 per ton.....	1.62
	<hr/>
	23.71
Add for net loss on material, first to last, 13 per cent.....	3.08
	<hr/>
Total.....	26.79
Divided as follows:	
Labor.....	\$4.09
Material and waste.....	22.70
	<hr/>
	26.79

The percentage of labor cost to the cost of production is 15.26 per cent. The percentage of labor cost to the average selling price of steel rails—namely, selling price of rails, \$37.50; labor, per ton, \$4.09—is 10.9 per cent. The present rate of \$17 per ton duty on steel rails is equal, under the present tariff, to an ad valorem duty of 85 per cent.

STEEL BEAMS OR STRUCTURAL IRON.

The principal difference in cost of making a ton of beams or structural steel and a ton of steel rails is about 30 per cent. additional in the cost of labor:

Cost of steel rails.....	\$26.79
30 per cent. on \$4.09 labor.....	1.23
Total.....	28.02

The value of steel beams imported into the United States in 1887 at foreign ports of shipment was 1.2 cents per pound, or \$26.88 per ton, and the duty upon the same under the present tariff is 1½ cents per pound, or the equivalent of \$28.88 per ton, or 102.75 per cent. ad valorem.

These estimates of cost in the United States represent net cost without profit or allowance for interest on or depreciation of plant, or for fuel for steam power, or Spiegeleisen, or manganese, the cost of steam power and Spiegeleisen adding very little to the cost per ton.

The cost of labor paid for the manufacture of a ton of steel beams, based upon the cost of production per ton,—namely, labor \$5.33, cost \$28.02,—is 19 per cent. The percentage labor received based on the selling price of a ton of steel beams, namely, \$5.33 for labor and \$66 per ton selling price, is 8.7 per cent.

The total output of steel rails, blooms, ingots, and beams at these works during the year 1887 was as follows:

	Tons of 2,240 pounds.
Steel rails.....	192,998
Blooms.....	220,235
Ingots.....	241,874
Steel beams (estimated).....	30,000

The number of men employed in producing the above, classed as skilled labor, and the actual wages paid them per day, as awarded by the board of arbitration of the Knights of Labor and accepted by the managers for the year 1887, were as follows:

CONVERTING DEPARTMENT.

Seventy-six men working on turns of eight hours, requiring for twenty-four hours 228 men: Gross amount paid 76 men per turn,

under contract, \$230.02; average daily wages of each man in the converting department, \$3.02.

BLOOMING DEPARTMENT.

Twenty-seven men working on turns of eight hours, requiring for twenty-four hours 81 men: Gross amount paid 27 men per turn, under contract, \$76.02; average daily wages of each man, \$2.81 $\frac{1}{2}$.

RAIL DEPARTMENT.

Forty-two men working on turns of eight hours, requiring for the twenty-four hours 126 men: Gross amount paid 42 men per turn, under contract, \$126.89; average daily wages of each man, \$3.02.

FINISHING DEPARTMENT.

One hundred and nineteen men working on turns of twelve hours, requiring for the twenty-four hours 238 men: Gross amount paid 119 men for twelve hours, under contract, \$230.01, average daily wages of each man, twelve hours, \$1.93.

Total amount of skilled labor employed, 673 men. Average daily wages paid 673 men, \$2.58.

The number of tons of steel rails produced per man at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works during the year 1887, the number of days employed not being taken into consideration, was 286.77 tons per man per annum.

As the total output of the entire force of men engaged in the Edgar Thomson Steel Works in 1887, in the converting, blooming, rail, and finishing departments, was: ingots, 241,874 tons; blooms, 220,235 tons, assumed to be represented by the steel-rail product of the mill, namely, 192,998 tons, and as the total output of the steel rails in the United States, according to the official statements, was 2,049,638 tons for the year 1887, this would, by inference, make the total number of skilled employes engaged in this industry in the United States, during the year 1887, 7,147 men.

Let us ascertain from these figures, if we can, what it costs the people of this country under the protectionist's theory and the existing tariff of to-day for steel rails alone, to equalize what they claim to be the difference between labor and material in England and labor and material in the United States, and then to ascertain, if we can, what proportion of this protection, claimed for the equalization of labor, labor receives. In producing a ton of steel rails, we started with the Bessemer pig-iron. The average price per ton of No. 1 Bessemer pig-iron during 1887 did not vary materially from \$18 per ton in Pittsburgh, and the average price for the same quality of iron

in England during the same period was \$12.50 per ton, or a difference of \$5.50 per ton.

As I have shown, the cost paid for the labor to produce a ton of steel rails at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works was \$4.09, and allowing a difference of even 50 per cent. in labor between England and the United States, which is excessive, to protect the wage-workers in this country engaged in the steel-rail factory against the so-called pauper labor of England, it would require \$2. These two items of the difference in cost of pig-iron and the difference in labor would equal \$7.50; and a duty on steel rails, therefore, of \$7.50 per ton would cover every claim upon which the theory of protection is based. But it costs something to get a ton of steel rails from Liverpool to our seacoast, and the average freight and insurance during the year 1887 from Liverpool to New York was about \$2 per ton, which is the equivalent of so much more protection to the producer in this country, and this, if deducted from the \$7.50, would still further reduce the necessary duty, even under their own theory, to \$5.50 per ton. But let us be liberal with them; let us call the freight and insurance 50 cents per ton, and then a duty of \$7 per ton, under their own claims and theories, would be ample. The present duty is \$17 per ton, and, if I am correct in my figures, \$10 per ton in excess of what is absolutely necessary, as they claim, not only to protect home labor, but to cover the difference in the cost of pig-iron.

I have shown that the cost to produce a ton of steel rails at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works in 1887 was \$26.79; and surely a profit of \$5 per ton on the number of tons of steel rails produced in the United States ought to satisfy the most avaricious manufacturer, and this would bring their selling price up to \$31.79 per ton, just about the average price in the United States to-day, namely, \$31.50 to \$32 per ton at the mill, and \$5 per ton profit on the output of steel rails for 1887 would be the equivalent of \$10,248,190 of profits divided between ten or twelve establishments engaged in this industry in this country. But the average price at which steel rails sold for in the United States during the year 1887 was \$37.12½ per ton, or \$5.33 in excess of the price to-day, or \$10,924,570.54 additional profit on the output of 1887, or an aggregate profit of \$21,171,760 to be divided between ten or twelve steel-rail mills in the United States; and I am satisfied that this is not very much out of the way.

When we come to structural iron and steel beams, although the output is much less than steel rails, yet the figures are more astounding. A fire-proof building cannot be erected in the country that structural iron and steel are not a material part of its cost. It is a large part of the cost in the railway and highway bridges of the

country. Its use not only adds to the durability of all structures, but in our large cities lessens the chances of conflagrations and reduces the rates of insurance. I have shown that the cost of a ton of structural steel produced at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works during the year 1887 was about \$28.02. But let us call it \$33. You cannot to-day buy a ton of steel beams for less than 3.3 cents per pound, or \$66 per ton.

It is well known that the steel-beam industry of this country to-day is in a trust; and I have further shown that the average price of these steel beams imported into this country during the year 1887, upon which duties were levied, was 1.2 cents per pound, or \$26.88 per ton, and that the duty upon them under the existing tariff is $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound, or \$28.88 per ton, the duty exceeding the value of the imported article \$2 per ton. The output of these steel beams at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works during the year 1887 averaged about 100 tons per day, or 30,000 tons per annum, and the difference between the cost of its production, \$33 per ton, and \$66 per ton, the selling price, leaves a margin of \$33 per ton, or \$1,000,000 profit on this one product alone; and I ask this House and the country whether or not the Committee on Ways and Means is justified in reducing the duty on steel rails from \$17 per ton to \$11 per ton, and on steel beams from $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound, which leaves the duty on steel rails under the proposed bill equal to 55 per cent. ad valorem, in place of 85 per cent. ad valorem under the existing tariff, and on steel beams at $44\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ad valorem, in place of 102 per cent. under the present law?

Mulhall, in his *History of Prices*, in referring to wages, page 127, says that the percentage of wages paid of the value of manufactures produced in the United States since 1850 was: In 1850, 23.3 per cent.; in 1860, 21.2 per cent.; in 1870, 19 per cent.; and in 1880, 17.8 per cent.; and that the British operatives earn, as a rule, in wages from 30 per cent. to 33 per cent. of the value of the manufactures they produce, while in the United States the workman gets only 17.8 per cent. On page 125 he states the advance in artisans' wages in England and France between the years 1840 and 1880 was as follows:

Occupation.	France.	England.
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Blacksmiths.....	45	64
Masons.....	55	70
Carpenters.....	55	60
Plumbers.....	57	70
Cotton spinners.....	42	48

COST OF BEAMS IN OTHER MILLS.

I also have before me a pamphlet entitled "The Edgar Thomson Steel Works," dated 1887. It is an authentic pamphlet, furnishing certain data, which could have only come from the proprietors of the company. I will only quote an abstract from the last page.

To keep the works running, on an average daily output of 1,400 tons of iron and manganese and 800 tons of rails, requires the handling, by loading and unloading, of 7,920 gross tons of material daily, namely, 2,300 tons of iron ore, 1,450 tons of coke, 670 tons of limestone, 1,400 tons of pig-metal, 1,000 tons of cinder, 800 tons of rails, 300 tons coal, sand, brick, molds, refractories, etc., a greater tonnage for these works alone than the entire cotton-crop of the United States.

If the proprietors of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works were indicted before a United States grand jury for obtaining money under false pretenses, namely, as parties to the tariff act of 1883, if this admission would not convict them, then I am at loss to know what would. With an average output daily of 1,400 tons of pig-iron and 800 tons of steel rails, their total consumption of coal is so insignificant as to be included in the items of "sand, brick, molds, refractories, etc.," at 300 tons total of these articles; and the number of tons of coke consumed, 1,450 tons, which, at the market price of to-day, figures \$1.10, would make a total cost per day of \$1,595, equal to a cost for fuel of only 72½ cents per ton on an output of 1,400 tons of pig-iron and 800 tons of steel rails, and in which estimate no allowance is made for natural gas.

Comparisons are always odious, but the latter part of this extract says:

A greater tonnage for these works alone than the entire cotton crop of the United States.

I will endeavor to make some approximate estimates and comparisons, which this pamphlet has failed to provide. One of the members of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, Limited, admitted to me within the past month, within 200 feet of where I now stand, that a statement made by myself in the fall of 1886 was correct, namely, that he drew out of the company as dividends in one year the sum of \$1,500,000, the equivalent of \$5,000 per day for three hundred days in the year, and this was but one member of the firm, with no statement of profits undivided. No intelligent business man will put the profits of this company at less than \$5,000,000 in prosperous years, and we will allow them to employ 8,500 wage-workers.

I wish distinctly to state here that I believe it to be the duty of

every man to accumulate every dollar possible in fair and open competition with his fellow-men; and that the dollar so accumulated by his industry, energy, and economy is entitled to its due share of protection by the Government without discrimination as between the rich and poor. I care not how many millions of dollars any man may thus accumulate; but what I protest against is that while the great masses of the people are weighed down in their struggle for existence the favored few are permitted to rob them, under the pretense of protection to home industry and home labor. [Applause.]

COTTON.

Let us find out if we can what the cotton-planter of the South is doing:

The average price per pound for cotton in 1886, on the plantation, was 8½ cents on a bale of 500 pounds.....	\$42.50
The most reliable estimates of cost of production gives labor 50 per cent. of the selling price of cotton on the plantation, namely, per bale.....	\$21.25
(As against only 8.7 per cent. of the selling price of a ton of steel beams which labor receives at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works.)	
Incidental cost to planter over labor cost.....	6.25
	<hr/> 27.50

Profit to planter per bale for interest on plantation and for supervision.. 15.00

This sum, \$15 per bale, on 6,500,000 bales, yield of 1886, would be \$97,500,000. [The total plantation value of the cotton-crop of 1886 was \$269,989,812, equal to a gross return for each acre cultivated of \$14.75.

The Commissioner of Agriculture, in his report of 1886, page 417, says:

The planters of the Southern States are selling the cheapest cotton in the world and buying all supplies at enormous prices, a practice which only fertile lands, abundant crops, and persistent industry can save from bankruptcy.

PROTECTED AND UNPROTECTED INDUSTRIES.

According to the pamphlet referred to in connection with the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, they represent that their whole area of ground is 154 acres, and we will concede that they employ 7,500 wage-workers—which they do not—in their various industries. According to official returns of the Agricultural Department, there are now under cultivation in the production of cotton 18,000,000

acres, and a fair estimate of the number of adults employed in cultivating these fields, allowing four bales to an adult, is 1,625,000 wage-workers, and allowing each one to represent a family of five, it would give a total of 8,125,000 of our people dependent upon this industry for a support and a living. I have estimated the net profits of the entire cotton-crop of 1886 at \$97,500,000, which represents the interest on the cost of the 18,000,000 acres of land and the supervision and other contingent expenses and liabilities to the planter.

Assuming that my statement that the said company's net profits in the most prosperous years are \$5,000,000, I would be pleased to have some mathematician work out for me the relative comparative profits realized by the protected industries of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, employing 7,500 men, with an estimated capital of \$20,000,000, occupying 154 acres of land and improvements on same, and the profits realized by the unprotected planters of the South, cultivating 18,000,000 acres of land, and employing 1,625,000 adults in this industry, supporting 8,125,000 of our population. Yet, when the committee introduced this bill into the House and proposed to put the cotton-ties in which this cotton had to be baled for exportation on the free-list, the gentlemen on the other side of the House denounced it as a discrimination against home industries and the theory of protection.

GRAIN REGIONS OF THE NORTH.

When we turn from the cotton-fields of the South to the grain regions of the North, we find that the condition of the latter is no better than that of the former. I shall not attempt to go into any detailed discussion as to why this is so, but will simply call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows], and submit to him an interrogatory, which he need not reply to until he has had an opportunity of seeing and conversing with the farmers of his own State, when, undoubtedly, he can do so more intelligently than now. According to the agricultural returns from the State of Michigan for the year 1885, we find the following cereals were produced:

Indian corn.....bushels..	30,706,000	Barley.....bushels..	1,200,000
Wheat.....do....	31,261,000	Buckwheat.....do....	433,000
Rye.....do....	250,000	Potatoes.....do....	12,880,000
Oats.....do....	21,780,000	Hay.....tons...	1,507,232

We also find that it required 4,690,304 acres to grow them; that the total value of the crops was \$64,445,697; and that the gross yield per acre averaged \$13.74; that under the census of 1880 the number

of persons in that State engaged in farming was 240,319; and I would ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows], after he has ascertained from the farmers of his State what they realized in the way of profits from these cereals, to compare their percentage with the profits of the protected industries of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, as illustrated in connection with the cotton-crop, and to give me his conclusions regarding the discrepancy.

NATURAL GAS.

And here, in immediate connection with this illustration, drawn from the Edgar Thomson Works, of the operations of a monopoly duty, swelling the profits of the manufacturer into most unreasonable and even appalling figures, whilst adding nothing to the wages of labor, either common or skilled, and at the same time restricting the market of the farmer for his produce, though simply pillaging him upon his purchases of implements and apparel, I beg to call the attention of this House, and of the country, to the new and natural force which is, in my opinion, destined to revolutionize, indeed has already in large degree revolutionized, some departments of American manufactures. I allude to natural gas. It is used at the Edgar Thomson Works; but it appears that the economy of its use has not as yet enabled the proprietors to reduce the price of their product, or to add anything to the wages paid.

It is the cheapest and most effective fuel ever discovered or invented by man. The world cannot show its equal. The Almighty has placed it in apparently inexhaustible quantities in the very heart-center of our so-called protected industries; and the applications of which it is capable are innumerable and unlimited. It needs not to be mined; it transports itself; it may be piped anywhere; it requires almost no labor to handle it, and it leaves no residuum or débris to be removed. It is the ideal fuel, and so hastens, cheapens, and improves the quality of production as to place ultimately every manufacturer within reach of its incalculable advantages beyond any possible competition of foreign rivalry. What then do the manufacturers, so fortunately situated, require to enable them to "take the start of this majestic world and bear the palm alone"? Nothing but free raw material, open markets around the globe, no unnecessary restrictions here or there, cheap food, cheap raiment, and cheap blankets. Western Pennsylvania, Eastern Ohio, and large areas besides, which are soon to be supplied with this marvelous agent, would, if they understood their true interests, and in a brief time will, exchange the pitiful cry of more subsidies

for the most thriving industries on earth, for a thundering demand for freedom of exchanges and cheap supplies.

ACCUMULATED WEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

The truth cannot be too often stated, nor falsehood too often exposed. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have frequently referred to our immense strides in the accumulation of wealth between 1850 and 1880, and this I admit; but they claim that protection has done this in the building up of our manufacturing industries. I will take their own figures, upon which they base this claim. I submit the following official table, which tells its own story:

The wealth of the United States and its development from 1850 to 1880.

[Compiled from the reports of the United States Census.]

Years.	True value of real estate and personal property.					
	Total.	Per capita.	Distribution.	Total.	Per capita.	Per cent. of group.
1850.....	\$7,135,780,228	\$308	Agriculture..... Manufactures..... Railroads..... All other.....	\$4,967,344,580 533,243,351 296,260,128 1,338,931,168	\$171 23 13 101	69.61 7.47 4.15 18.77
1860.....	16,159,616,068	514	Agriculture..... Manufactures..... Railroads..... All other.....	7,980,493,063 1,009,855,715 1,134,452,909 6,034,814,381	254 32 36 192	49.39 6.25 7.02 37.34
1870.....	24,054,814,806	624	Agriculture..... Manufactures..... Railroads..... All other.....	8,899,966,997 1,634,567,152 1,632,980,616 11,827,300,041	231 44 42 307	37.00 7.04 6.79 49.17
1880.....	43,642,000,000	870	Agriculture..... Manufactures..... Railroads..... All other.....	12,104,081,440 2,790,272,606 4,112,367,175 24,635,278,779	241 56 82 491	27.74 6.39 9.42 56.45

Years.	Increase during decade.						
	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.	Distribution.	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.
1860.....	\$9,023,835,840	126.46	\$330	<div> <div>Agriculture.....</div> <div>Manufactures...</div> <div>Railroads.....</div> <div>All other.....</div> </div>	<div> <div>\$3,013,149,483</div> <div>476,610,364</div> <div>838,192,781</div> <div>4,695,883,212</div> </div>	<div> <div>62.66</div> <div>89.39</div> <div>282.94</div> <div>350.72</div> </div>	<div> <div>\$110</div> <div>18</div> <div>31</div> <div>172</div> </div>
1870.....	7,895,198,738	48.86	296	<div> <div>Agriculture.....</div> <div>Manufactures...</div> <div>Railroads.....</div> <div>All other.....</div> </div>	<div> <div>919,473,934</div> <div>684,711,437</div> <div>498,527,707</div> <div>5,792,485,660</div> </div>	<div> <div>11.52</div> <div>67.80</div> <div>43.94</div> <div>95.93</div> </div>	<div> <div>26</div> <div>20</div> <div>14</div> <div>166</div> </div>
1880.....	19,587,185,194	81.43	442	<div> <div>Agriculture.....</div> <div>Manufactures...</div> <div>Railroads.....</div> <div>All other.....</div> </div>	<div> <div>3,304,114,443</div> <div>1,095,705,454</div> <div>2,479,386,559</div> <div>12,807,978,738</div> </div>	<div> <div>36.00</div> <div>64.66</div> <div>151.83</div> <div>108.30</div> </div>	<div> <div>72</div> <div>25</div> <div>56</div> <div>289</div> </div>

The wealth of the United States and its development from 1850 to 1880—
Continued.

Years.	Increase since 1850.						
	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.	Distribution.	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.
1860.....	\$9,023,835,840	126.46	\$330	Agriculture.....	\$3,013,149,483	60.66	\$110
				Manufactures....	476,610,364	89.39	18
				Railroads.....	638,192,781	262.94	31
				All other.....	4,605,883,212	350.72	172
1870.....	16,919,083,578	237.11	545	Agriculture.....	3,932,623,417	79.17	127
				Manufactures....	1,161,321,801	217.78	37
				Railroads.....	1,336,720,488	451.20	43
				All other.....	10,488,368,872	758.69	338
1880....	36,506,219,772	511.60	1,019	Agriculture.....	7,136,737,860	143.66	199
				Manufactures....	2,257,027,255	423.26	63
				Railroads.....	3,816,107,047	1,288.09	107
				All other.....	23,296,347,610	1,739.37	650

NOTES.—Gold being at a premium of 25 in 1870, the data for that year reported by the United States Census have been reduced to gold value.

"Agriculture" represents the value of the farms, farm implements and machinery, and of live-stock.

"Manufactures" represents the capital invested in manufactures.

"Railroads" represents the cost of constructing the railroads.

WM. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, May 4, 1886.

The principal facts to be remembered in connection with the foregoing table are:

First. That of the gross accumulations of wealth between 1850 and 1880, as shown by the census, namely, \$36,506,219,722,

	Per cent.
Farm lands and personal property on same, gave.....	19.55
Capital invested in manufactures.....	6.18
Railroads.....	10.45
All other industries and suburban property.....	63.82
	100.00

Second. That the percentage of gain in manufactures in the decades named was as follows:

	Per cent.
Between 1850 and 1860, low tariff.....	89.39
Between 1860 and 1870, high tariff.....	67.80
Between 1870 and 1880, high tariff.....	64.66

Third. That the percentage of gain in farming lands and personal property on same was as follows:

	Per cent.
Between 1850 and 1860, low tariff.....	60.66
Between 1860 and 1870, high tariff.....	11.52
Between 1870 and 1880, high tariff.....	36.00

Fourth. That had the agricultural resources of the country between 1870 and 1880 maintained the same relative gain shown be-

tween 1850 and 1860, the latter period being under a tariff for revenue and the former under a protective tariff, the increase would have been \$2,125,000,000 more, or within \$665,272,606 of the total value of capital invested in manufactures in the United States in 1880.

Fifth. That the percentage of manufactures to the wealth of the country accumulated in thirty years is only 6.18 per cent.

I would also refer, here, to the fact that between 1860 and 1880, the number of immigrants that arrived in this country, was 5,093,333; the larger proportion of which it is reasonable to suppose, engaged in agricultural pursuits.

It is also claimed that the balance of trade in our favor since 1873 is the result of the protective theory. From 1873 to June 30, 1887, our exports exceeded our imports by \$1,611,973,748.

Our total exports for the year 1886 were \$665,964,529, of which \$484,594,595 were derived from agriculture; and the exports of cotton and cotton-seed oil, represented in the latter item, were \$207,201,616, or nearly 50 per cent. of the agricultural products exported, and the ratio of agricultural products exported to the total exports was 72.8 per cent. If, sir, the same ratio is applicable to the balance in our favor between the years 1873 and 1887, it will show that of this balance the non-protected industries of this country—

The farmer and cotton-planter gave you 72.8, or.....	\$1,173,516,888
Other industries, 27.2, or.....	438,456,860
Total.....	1,611,973,748

COAL MINING.

Permit me to refer to another great industry in my State, coal mining; an industry, sir, which protection does not protect, and then compare the wages paid in the Edgar Thomson Steel Works with the wages of the skilled miner.

Under the tariff of 1883 the following products manufactured in this country, if imported, are subject to the following equivalent ad valorem duties:

	Per cent.
Pig-iron	50.50
Iron railroad bars.....	65.26
Bar-iron	46.42
Steel rails.....	54.57
Railway fish-plates.....	92.75
Anchors.....	68 26
Steel beams, girders, etc.	102.75

Twelve or fifteen miles from the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, on the Youghiogheny River, at Scott Haven, is located the mines of

the Youghiogheny River Coal Company, a large coal-mining property, employing a large number of men. Coal from these mines has for years past been shipped to a greater or less extent to Havana Cardenas, Matanzas, Sagua, and other West India ports, in competition with the coal produced by the so-called pauper labor of England. It is exported largely to Canada; it finds a market as far South via the Ocean as Galveston, Tex., and as far North as Boston, Mass. I submit, the names of and the actual wages earned by and paid to forty skilled miners working at these mines between April 1 and December 1, 1887, in comparison with the wages paid the skilled workmen in the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, the latter industry protected by duties averaging from 50 per cent. to 102 per cent. ad valorem, as follows:

Statement showing the earnings of a number of miners regularly employed at the Youghiogheny River Coal Company's mines from April 1 to December 1, 1887.

Name.	Number of days worked.	Total amount earned.	Average daily earnings.
Daniel Harrington.....	168½	\$636.17	\$3.78
John Wolff.....	174½	780.05	4.48
Fred. Walters.....	174½	529.36	3.04
John B. Miller.....	176½	632.18	3.59
Joseph Southern.....	176	751.32	4.26
Peter Beck.....	170½	564.52	3.32
Adam Darr.....	152	477.09	3.13
Patrick Nolan.....	166	418.80	2.52
Valentine Naw.....	149	565.05	3.79
James Farrow.....	177	625.75	3.53
James Robinson.....	178	921.00	5.17
Thomas Seddon.....	163	407.03	2.50
Peter McAlinden.....	174	489.46	2.81
George Doerhaver.....	150	485.28	3.23
Hugh Donnelly.....	153	678.72	4.43
Isaac John.....	172	450.35	2.61
Robert Cain.....	167	473.83	2.83
Charles Mortle.....	163	451.76	2.77
Robert Herniman.....	179	543.86	3.03
George Fein.....	170	576.70	3.37
Robert Carroll.....	171	564.57	3.30
David Edwards.....	151	515.90	3.41
Charles Metz.....	157	484.09	3.08
Robert White.....	156	376.02	2.41
John Mellville.....	157	511.01	3.25
John Gibson.....	167	413.62	2.47
John Donnelly.....	166	549.76	3.13
Joseph W. Mortle.....	167	485.67	2.90
Sampson Spate.....	150	530.05	3.53
Robert Davis.....	165	629.97	3.81
David Lake.....	170	661.47	3.85
James Abercrombie.....	149	426.55	2.86
Patrick Curran.....	154	430.26	2.79
Frank Herniman.....	170	644.84	3.79
George Ashoff.....	169	553.98	3.28
John Dick.....	171	678.51	2.97
William H. Webster.....	163	488.73	2.99
John Robertson.....	163	569.42	3.48
Total.....	6,269½	20,942.70	3.34

Average earnings of each miner for period, \$551.12.

The wages paid the foregoing skilled miners, selected as a fair representation of that class, were, highest daily wages for eight hours' work, \$5.17, and the lowest, \$2.41. Average wages earned per day by them, \$3.34 per man, and the average total amount earned by each man for the same period, \$551.12. Of the total number of all grades of labor, skilled and unskilled, including boys employed in and about the mines, namely, 757, the average wages earned per day per man was \$1.96.

According to the official report of the Secretary of Internal Affairs of the State of Pennsylvania for the year 1884, the number of miners employed, wages paid, and tons of coal produced, was as follows:

	Miners.	Wages paid.	Coal.
			<i>Tons.</i>
Anthracite coal.....	83,316	\$29,906,262	25,651,664
Bituminous coal.....	38,906	14,752,786	18,084,941
Total.....	122,222	\$44,659,048	43,736,605

From a practical experience of over one-third of a century in the coal-mines of my State, both anthracite and bituminous, I am justified in stating that the wage-worker receives for his labor, directly and indirectly, from 70 per cent. to 85 per cent. of the selling price of the coal at the mines, as against the 8 per cent. that labor receives at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, on the selling price of a ton of steel beams. The tariff does not protect the coal-miner, but robs him in just so far as it increases the cost of what he consumes by the imposition of duties the Government does not need to meet its requirements. And if time would permit, I could submit facts in connection with the prices of labor in the various industries of this country, not confined to my own State, but in the States of Iowa and Illinois, proving beyond any question, from the pay-rolls I could submit, that the average wages received by the wage-worker of the country outside of the protected industries show that protection does not benefit the wage-worker in the protected industries of the country.

WOOL.

I turn now to another vexed question—wool. When I call it vexed, I do not mean that it is not clear or easily solved upon correct principles, but only that our friend, the Bourbon, takes his stand upon wool and howls the more lugubriously, albeit more unreasonably, than on anything else, because he hopes there' to delude the farming interest to his support. This bill puts wool on the free-list,

It does so, I make bold to maintain, not only in the interest of the woolen manufacturer, but in that of sheep-husbandry itself.

In referring to the woolen schedule and its effects upon the people of my own State, it is fair to infer that relatively it will have the same effect upon the people of the other States of the Union. I am compelled to refer to the census of 1880, and to resort to statistics, which are not as interesting to the general reader as the latest novel, but may be more instructive. According to the Agricultural Report of 1886, the number of sheep in Pennsylvania was 1,189,481; number of farms in the State (census of 1880), 213,542; average number of sheep to the farm, 5.5; pounds of wool clipped, 5,645,984; average weight of fleece, $4\frac{1}{4}$ pounds, which, at the estimated market price of to-day, 32 cents per pound, would give a total value of \$1,806,714.88. Should the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means become a law, the result upon the people of my State would be as follows: First, upon the farmers: The 213,542 farms produced, as stated above, in 1886, 5,645,984 pounds of wool, equal to 26 pounds of wool to the farm, and the duties upon foreign wools of the same quality, unwashed, under the present tariff of 10 cents per pound would amount to \$564,598.40. If making wool free would cause the value to decline equal to the duty now imposed, which it would not, in my judgment, it would show a gross loss to the 213,542 farms of \$2.60 each, or a total of \$564,598. *Per contra*, the per capita consumption of domestic and imported woolen and worsted goods, according to the census of 1880, was \$6.50, which multiplied by five, the estimated average number in a family, would be \$32.50.

The proposed reduction in the woolen schedule is 29 per cent. from the present tariff, or 29 per cent. of the cost of the woolen goods consumed, which would be an equivalent saving of.....	\$9.42
The proposed reduction of the duties on sugar, namely, \$11,000,000 on the imports, and \$1,000,000 reduction on the cost of home production, would be \$12,000,000, or the equivalent of 20 cents per capita on a population of 60,000,000, or on a family of five.....	1.00
	<hr/> 10.42
From which deduct the estimated loss to each family of.....	2.60
	<hr/> 7.82
It would on these two items alone show a saving to every family in the State of Pennsylvania of.....	7.82

The profit and loss account of the bill under consideration to the people of the State, based on the population of 1880, namely, 4,282,891, would show a saving of \$1.56 each, or \$6,681,309.96 on these two items alone, and not taking into consideration the large savings

that will accrue to them from the other proposed reductions under the bill. But let us examine the woolen schedule as proposed in the bill, from the standpoint of the Pennsylvania manufacturer of woolen and worsted goods, and which I claim is applicable to the woolen manufacturers of the whole country. According to the census of 1880 there were in the State of Pennsylvania manufacturing establishments of woolen goods as follows:

Number of mills or factories producing—

Woolen goods.....	324
Woolen hats.....	23
Worsted goods.....	28

Total.....	375
------------	-----

Total amount of capital invested.....	\$24,537,743
---------------------------------------	--------------

Cost of material used for one year.....	29,497,945
---	------------

Gross wages paid.....	7,046,273
-----------------------	-----------

Pounds of wool consumed, grown in the United States	28,556,077
---	------------

Imported wools, pounds.....	5,005,271
-----------------------------	-----------

Total consumption of wool, pounds.....	33,561,348
--	------------

Total value of the manufactured articles produced for the year ending June 30, 1880.....	\$44,132,590
---	--------------

Average number of hands employed:

Males over sixteen.....	10,790
-------------------------	--------

Females above fifteen.....	9,477
----------------------------	-------

Children.....	3,571
---------------	-------

Total number of persons.....	23,838
------------------------------	--------

Average wages paid per hand per year.....	\$287.20
---	----------

It will be seen that while Pennsylvania consumed 33,561,348 pounds of wool in her mills in the year 1880, she only produced within the State, in 1886, 5,645,984 pounds, or 16½ per cent. of the quantity required in 1880, and that there were employed in this industry 23,838 of her population. It is hardly necessary to discuss the importance of cheap raw material to such an industry. Wool is the purest raw material, if any commodity known to trade can be designated as raw material. That it is to a very great extent the product of the soil and climate where it is grown is unquestionable. Now, the entire fleece of no animal can be used, as a rule, in the manufacture of the same kinds and qualities of cloth. In other words, the wool grown on different parts of a sheep not only has a different value but is adapted to different purposes, and while the unwashed wools of South America lose from 66 per cent. to 70 per cent. of their weight in washing, those of Australia show a shrink-

age of but from 52 to 60 per cent., and the English and the Irish wools show a shrinkage of but from 33 to 35 per cent. Under existing conditions the home manufacturer is unable to supply his mills with foreign wools, and the large importations of woollen goods, to which I will refer, is the result. To enable the manufacturer of this country to compete in his home market and to export a surplus abroad, he must be able to purchase his wool as favorably not only as to price but as to selection of qualities and kinds as does his foreign competitor.

The estimated total production of wool in the United States in 1886, according to the best authorities, was 300,000,000 pounds, and the estimated amount required, or its equivalent in woollen or worsted goods, to meet our necessities was 600,000,000 pounds. It will be seen, therefore, that we did not produce in 1886 within 300,000,000 pounds of wool necessary for our home consumption. The importations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, were 23,000,000 pounds, which would leave an estimated deficit of 277,000,000 pounds. We can best ascertain how this deficit in our requirements is made up by referring to the importations of manufactured woollen and worsted goods for the year ending June 30, 1887, which amounted to \$42,448,127.04, upon which there was collected by the Government a tax of \$29,256,442.90. Not one pound of American wool was used in the manufacture of the woollen and worsted goods covered by these large importations, nor did an American wage-worker receive one dollar in connection with their manufacture; and it is a conceded fact to-day that of all our industries not one is so depressed as the woollen industry. If there can be an exception, it is that of the carpet manufacturers, which can be accounted for from the fact that the duties on the wools used by them are merely nominal, while on the higher grades they are practically prohibitory. The present duty of 10 cents per pound on unwashed wools is equivalent to 30 cents per pound on scoured wools.

No better illustration of the results of moderate duties or free raw material can be pointed to than the carpet industries of this country. Russian carpet wools, grown in Southern Russia, bordering on the Black Sea, practically scoured, are largely imported into the United States for the manufacture of carpets. A fair average price for these long combing wools at Black Sea ports is from 17 cents to 20 cents per pound, our currency. The duty upon same under our existing tariff, is 5 cents per pound. Wool, scoured, suitable for the manufacture of men's wear, under the present tariff, pays 30 cents per pound. To-day, owing to this low duty on carpet wools and the superior genius of our American workmen and notwithstanding the higher wages

paid in the United States, I am credibly informed that if this 5 cents per pound is removed from Donskoi and other carpet wools we can compete with the world on carpets, and keep our home market.

But another important factor meets the manufacturer in the purchase of his wools; it is those artificial restrictions and resulting complications which deprive him of the mastery of his own business, and often makes the difference between complete success and total failure; and in this connection it may be well to inquire how the tariff of 1883 has affected the woolen and worsted industries of the country, particularly in connection with our home market, which the protectionists are so desirous of keeping for our home manufacturers. A statement of the cost of producing a pound of worsted yarns in this country and in England, under the existing tariff, taking the yarns as the basis of the cost of the manufactured article, may perhaps account for the present condition of our woolen and worsted industries and the large importations I have referred to; and I submit the following tables:

TABLE NO. 1.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 30s yarn out of English wool under the present tariff in the United States.*

Wool, cost in London 11 <i>d.</i> or in United States currency.....	\$0.22
Commissions, freight, and charges, say02
Duty.....	.10
	<hr/>
	.34
	<hr/>
Take, say, of greasy wool.....pounds..	100.00
Which would shrink.....do....	20.00
	<hr/>
Leaving of clean wool.....do....	80.00
	<hr/>
Eighty pounds, costing \$34, equals 42½ cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds costs.....	\$42.50
Deduct value of noil made, 10 pounds, at 25 cents.....	2.50
	<hr/>
Divide by top produced, 90 pounds	40.00
Equals 44 cents, cost of top.....	<hr/>
Take 1 pound of top, costing.....	.44
Spinning to 30s, including waste.....	.28
	<hr/>
Cost of 1 pound yarn under existing tariff.....	.72
	<hr/>
Market price of this yarn in England, 1 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i> , or.....	.40
Add duty, 12 cents and 25 per cent. ad valorem.....	.28
Commission, freight, and charges.....	.04
	<hr/>
Total.....	.70

This table shows that under the tariff of 1883 you can import 1 pound of 30s yarn, manufactured in England, for 2 cents per pound less than it can be made in the United States for, out of English wool imported into this country.

TABLE No. 2.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 30s worsted yarn out of English wool, under the bill under consideration—wool free.*

100 pounds of wool at 22 cents.....	\$22.00
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	2.00
Total.....	24.00
<hr/>	
90 pounds costing \$24 = 30 cents pound, clean, or—	
100 pounds costs.....	30.00
Deduct value of noil made, 10 pounds at 25 cents.....	2.50
Divide by top produced, 90 pounds.....	27.50
Equals 30 cents cost of top.	
Take 1 pound of top, costing.....	.30
Spinning to 30s, including waste.....	.28
Cost of 1 pound yarn under present bill.....	.58
Market price of this yarn in England, 1s. 8d., or.....	.40
Add duties, 40 per cent. ad valorem.....	.16
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	.04
Total.....	.60

This table shows that under the proposed bill 1 pound of the same yarn made from English wool can be made in the United States for over 2 cents per pound less than it can be imported from England for, and the cost of production reduced 14 cents per pound less than it costs under the tariff of 1883.

TABLE No. 3.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s fine worsted yarn out of Australian wool, under tariff of 1883.*

Wool cost in London 11d., or in United States currency.....	\$0.22
Commissions, freight, and charges, say.....	0.02
Duty.....	0.10
Total.....	0.34
<hr/>	
Pounds.	
Take, say, of greasy wool.....	100
Which will shrink 55 per cent.....	55
Leaving clean wool.....	45

45 pounds, costing \$34 = 75 cents per pound, clean, or 100 pounds, costs.....	\$75.00
Deduct value of noils made, 18 pounds, at 45 cents.....	8.10
Divide by top produced, 82 pounds....	66.90
Equals 82 cents, cost of top per pound.	
Take 1 pound of top, costing.....	\$0.82
Spinning to 36s, including waste.....	0.35
Cost of 1 pound yarn under existing tariff.....	1.17
Market price of this yarn in England, 2s. 5½d., or.....	\$0.59
Add duties, 18 cents and 35 per cent. ad valorem.....	0.39
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	0.04
Total.....	1.02

This table shows that it costs 15 cents per pound more under the tariff of 1883 to make 1 pound of fine worsted yarn in the United States, out of Australian wool, than what the same yarn can be made for in England and imported into the United States:

TABLE NO. 4.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s fine worsted yarn out of Australian wool, under the bill now before the House—wool free*

100 pounds of wool, at 22 cents.....	\$22.00
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	2.00
Total.....	24.00
45 pounds costing \$24 = 53 cents per pound, clean, or 100 pounds, cost.....	53.00
Deduct value of noils made, 18 pounds, at 45 cents.....	8.10
Equals 55 cents cost of top per pound.	44.90
Take 1 pound of top, costing.....	.55
Spinning to 36s, including waste....	.35
Cost of yarn under proposed bill.....	.90
Market price of this yarn in England, 2s. 5½d., or.....	.59
Add duties, 40 per cent. ad valorem.....	.24
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	.04
Total.....	.87

This table shows that under the proposed bill it will cost 3 cents per pound more to make 1 pound of yarn of the same quality and wool in the United States than it can be imported from England for, but that the proposed bill reduces the cost of manufacture in the United States and the import price 15 cents per pound less than it now costs.

TABLE No. 5.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s yarn out of Australian cross-breds under the present tariff.*

Wool, costing in London 14 <i>d.</i> , or in United States currency.....	\$0.28
Commissions, freight, and charges, say.....	.02
Duty.....	.10
Total.....	.40
Take, say, of greasy wool.....pounds..	100
Which would shrink 30 per cent.....do....	30
Leaving clean wool.....do....	70
70 pounds, costing \$40 = 57 cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds cost..	\$57.00
Deduct value of noil made, 15 pounds at 35 cents.....	5.25
Divide by top produced, 85 pounds.....	51.75
Equals 61 cents cost of top.....	
Take 1 pound of top, costing.....	.61
Spinning to 36s including waste.....	.35
Cost of 1 pound of yarn under existing tariff.....	.96
Market price of this yarn in England, 2 <i>s.</i> , 2 <i>d.</i> , or.....	.52
Add duty 18 cents and 35 per cent. ad valorem.....	.37
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	.04
Total.....	.93

This table shows that it costs 3 cents per pound more under the tariff of 1883 to make 1 pound of this yarn in the United States out of Australian cross-bred wool than what the same yarn can be had for in England and imported to the United States.

TABLE No. 6.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s yarn out of Australian cross-breds under the bill now before the House.*

100 pounds of wool, at 28 cents.....	\$28.00
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	2.00
Total	30.00

70 pounds, costing \$30 = 43 cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds cost..	43.00
Deduct value of noils made, 15 pounds, at 35 cents.....	5.25

Divide by top produced, 85 pounds.....	37.75
Equals 45 cents cost of top.	

Take 1 pound of top, costing.....	.45
Spinning to 36s, including waste.....	.35

Cost of 1 pound of yarn under proposed bill.....	.80
--	-----

Market price of this yarn in England, 2s, 2d, or.....	.52
Add duties, 40 per cent. ad valorem.....	.21
Commissions, freight, and charges.....	.04

Total.....	.77
------------	-----

This table shows that under the proposed bill it will cost 3 cents per pound more to make 1 pound of yarn of the same quality and wool in the United States than it can be imported from England for, but that the proposed bill reduces the cost of manufacture in the United States and the import price of 16 cents per pound less than it now costs.

The aim of the majority of the committee has been, first, to readjust the duties upon woolen and worsted goods so as to enable the manufacturers not only to pay the same wages they are now paying but to cheapen goods, thus enabling them to command the home market, which they are largely deprived of, and to compete in the foreign one. Free raw wool and the duties proposed on the manufactures of wool will accomplish that object unless we are grievously mistaken. "But what," cries the politician, "of the flock and the flock-owner; will not the removal of the duty reduce the value of the fleece by just that amount?" In my judgment, it will not. Even if it did, the average flock-owner, in common with all other husbandmen, would gain more than his loss in the reduced cost of the necessities of life provided in this bill. But let us see the probable effect upon the value of wool, should wool pass to the free-list. Wool, like every other commodity, is governed by the law of supply and demand. We now produce in this country about three hundred millions of pounds less than we require, as is clearly shown by our consumption of imported wools. Immediately wool is free, our manufacturers begin to draw upon the markets of the world for raw material to meet the American demand. The result is an advance in wool in foreign markets, and an advance abroad would advance the price here, tariff or no tariff. And this is no mere speculation; it is

the known history of wool under the circumstances supposed. Albert Gallatin, as far back as 1832, stated the facts as follows, and precisely as any reasonably-informed economist would state them to-day:

The object of the wool-growers is that that market should be enlarged, but this cannot be done effectually unless the domestic manufacturer is firmly established; and for that purpose it is necessary that the raw materials should be obtained on reasonable terms. To enhance its price by persevering in the existing exorbitant duties is not less inconsistent with sound policy than with justice. * * * The value of the hides and raw skins imported free of duty and consumed in the United States has for the last nine years exceeded \$1,800,000 a year. It is evident that if in order to protect the raising of American cattle by giving an additional value to the hide a high duty had been laid on those imported, the domestic manufacture of leather in all its branches, instead of being in its present flourishing state, would have been most materially injured, and we should have been obliged either to import from Europe or to purchase at exorbitant prices all those articles which it now supplies at a moderate rate.

The reduction in England of the duty on foreign wool to 4 cents a pound has caused a fall in price of the woolen goods without injuring the wool-grower at home. The free introduction of the species not raised here would, by encouraging the manufacture generally, ultimately enlarge the market for the domestic wool. It is the only way to introduce the manufacture of blankets and to reduce the price of home-made flannels and of the coarser species of cloth.

We produce in this country some wools equal to any in the world, but most of them are the coarser and cheaper grades, which are best adapted for the filling of the manufactured goods; while the long-fibered wools of England, America, and Australia are specially adapted for the warps. The wools of Texas, the Territories, and the Pacific Slope, where the sheep are largely pastured on the Government domain, or vast stretches of land comparatively valueless, are the lower grades. They cannot be used without admixture of the higher grades, and were the manufacturer able to import these higher grades free, the circumstances would immediately enlarge the market, and raise the prices of domestic wools, a proposition not in the least doubtful, but borne out by our experience in the past.

OUR MERCHANT MARINE.

No people can be a great people who do not "go down to the sea in ships." With longer coast lines than any other nation in the world, producing a greater quantity of sea-borne tonnage, if we eliminate coal, we are yet dependent upon other nations for ships to do our carrying. But for the energy and enterprise of the English

people during the past thirty years it would be impossible for us to find transportation for the commodities we produce in excess of our own requirements for exportation, and we are dependent upon the foreigner to-day for the marketing of our surplus, produced, by the way, almost exclusively by our unprotected industries. Transportation enters so largely into the cost of sea-borne merchandise as to average 10 per cent. of the value of the commodity transported; and while England and her colonies owned 58 per cent. of the sea-going tonnage of the world, according to the returns of 1883, the proportion of the United States was 4.5 per cent.; and it can hardly be denied that the profits of England from this source will far exceed the apparent difference between her exports and imports, as shown by her trade reports.

What has brought about this state of affairs? If we go back to 1860, we find that of our own exports and imports, American vessels carried 67 per cent. as against 33 per cent. in foreign bottoms, and that in 1882 we carried 16 per cent. as against 84 per cent. in foreign bottoms; and the Annual Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, for 1887, page 59, says: "There was a decline in the proportion of value of commodities carried in our own vessels, from 75 per cent. in 1856, to 14 per cent. in 1887. Prior to the year 1860, the ships of the world were constructed of wood, and the great sea-carrying trade of the world was done by sailing vessels. The great pineries of the State of Maine and the white oak of the swamps of Florida could not be combined into a trust. American ingenuity and enterprise were free to exert themselves in any direction that led to prosperity. In 1860 the sea-borne tonnage of the world flying the American flag was about equal to that of England. We were the second if not the first maritime people in the world. At that date the relative population between England and the United States was, England 28,730,000, and the United States 31,440,000. According to the census of 1880, our population exceeded that of England by 15,760,000 and the relative sea-borne tonnage of the world was, England 58 per cent. and the United States 4.5 per cent."

I think I hear some of my Republican friends ask, "What of the Alabama and the Shenandoah?" and they will tell you that the war of the rebellion exterminated the flag of our trade from the ocean. I will admit that the war of the rebellion was the cause of American ship-owners transferring their wooden ships to foreign flags; and if in these transfers they received a fair equivalent of their value at that time, from a pecuniary and commercial point of view, the country ought to have been a large gainer by the transaction. The wooden sailing-ship was doomed in the year 1860, and the

iron and steel ship, propelled by steam, was destined to supplant it upon economic grounds. The life of an iron ship and the cost of maintaining it, as compared with a wooden ship, its ability to carry 20 per cent. more cargo than a wooden ship of the same custom-house tonnage, the utilization of the compound engine, followed by the triplicate and to-day the quadruple engine, bringing the consumption of fuel down to a minimum, and making steam absolutely cheaper as a propelling power than the winds, all combined to doom the wooden ship. The construction of the Suez Canal left it no longer optional as to what the ship of the future was to be. Can it be claimed that the people of this nation could not and would not have adjusted themselves to this changed condition of affairs, had not unwise legislation prevented them from doing so? What is a steel or iron ship? What proportion of its cost consists of structural iron or steel beams? And how was it possible for the individual enterprise of this country to engage in the construction of iron ships when steel beams could be bought in England for \$26.88 per ton, while the same beams cost in the United States 3.3 cents per pound, or \$66 per ton? What has brought us to this low state? The policy of restriction. Protecting a few sickly ship-yards, we turn out an occasional vessel for the coastwise trade.

Under this policy, cruel, barbarous, Bourbon, our magnificent foreign merchant-marine has sunk into insignificance, and that seminary of dauntless sailors, that sure reserve of national defense, which once excited the admiration of Burke and of Chatham, has disappeared under the blight of your illiberal laws! We rank, in consequence, far down, not merely in our capacity to carry on the seas, but in our ability to fight on them. And because we have ceased to be a respectable naval power, we hear to-day the proposition to empty the Treasury upon land defenses, to take the place of the sea defenses you have blindly destroyed.

THE THEORY OF PROTECTION.

And now I will briefly state what I understand to be the theory of protection as advocated by the Republican party, and what that party claims to be the practical results of such a policy upon the country, as shown by the last thirty years, in its favor.

First. That a tariff for protection has given and will give the wage-workers working in the protected industries of the country higher wages, steadier work, and cheaper living.

Second. That the duties imposed on the agricultural products of the country protect the farmer, give him a home market at an en-

hanced price for his produce, and lessen the burdens he would otherwise be subject to.

Third. That the policy of protection has made the country rich and prosperous whenever high protective tariffs have prevailed, and that the reverse has been the case under moderate tariffs for revenue with incidental protection; and the protectionists point to the immense accumulations of wealth in the United States in the three decades between 1850 and 1880, namely, \$7,135,780,228 in 1850, and \$43,642,000,000 in 1880, or an increase of \$36,506,219,722 in thirty years.

This is all that is claimed for protection.

If these propositions can be demonstrated to be true by practical results, I pledge myself to vote with the gentlemen on the other side of the House.

I claim that I have shown by the facts submitted that even the skilled wage-worker employed in the protected industries of the country receives no higher and often not as high wages as the wage-worker in the unprotected industries of the country. That while undue protection does not increase the wages of the wage-worker employed in the manufacturing industries of the country, it adds enormously to the cost of his living, as well as to that of the minister of the gospel, the doctor, the lawyer, the carpenter, the mason, the blacksmith, the widow and the orphan, and that large class of our people living upon limited incomes, those too old to work; and upon no class are its effects more disastrous than upon the agricultural classes; that the home-market theory to the farmer is a fallacy; that if the census of 1880 is reliable, and that 17,392,099 of our population were engaged in the five great classes of occupations, of the agricultural products produced and consumed in the United States the relative consumption would be as follows:

	Per cent.
Agriculture.....	7,670,493, or 44.1
Professional and personal services.....	4,074,238, or 23.4
Trade and transportation	1,810,256, or 10.4
Mining and engineering.....	1,104,517, or 6.4
Manufacturing.....	2,732,595, or 15.7
Total.....	17,392,099 100.0

Which would show that the farmers and those dependent upon them were consumers to the extent of 44.1 per cent. of what they produced themselves, while three classes named consumed 40.2 per cent., leaving only 15.7 per cent. for those engaged in manufacturing.

That the protection theory has exterminated our shipping from the seas of the world; that the table submitted, showing how the accumulated wealth of the United States has been made between the years 1850 and 1880, demonstrates that protection to home industries had little or nothing to do with it.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

We are here—we, the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and of this House—in defense of American industry. We alone offer it protection; we seek alone the independence and aggrandizement of domestic labor by liberating it from unnatural restraints and allowing it the undisturbed possession and the complete enjoyment of its own earnings. The other side offer it—what? A monopolized market from which to buy the necessities of life on the one hand, and on the other a labor market subject to the caprice of trusts! In short, they promise it the inestimable boon of working in the protected industries, where no share of the bounty alleged protection affords is allotted to labor, and of bearing in common with the rest of the people of the United States the terrible exactions of the protective system to enrich the privileged classes.

Will laboring men accept that generous tender and vote with the monopoly party under coercion of the employer? If they do, the hideous disaster, foreseen by Jefferson, as the natural result of the restrictive and subsidy policy, will rush down upon us, and the Government of the Union will pass into the hands of those who openly propose to pervert its powers and employ them to plunder the people for their own enrichment. I do not believe that American liberty is destined to be extinguished in this ignominious fashion. Surviving, as it has, armed assault, and every form of intrigue, it will not perish of the base corruption of subsidy; it will not be throttled by mere greeds or smothered by vile monopoly.

As to the spirit of this side of the House, the spirit in which we enter this struggle for the very life of the Constitution and the emancipation of American labor, I cannot better express it than in the language of Andrew Jackson, the illustrious Democrat and beloved patriot, who, like our Presidential leader of to-day [applause], summoned the people to the reclamation of precious rights, slowly and almost imperceptibly filched away by the money power in a long course of years. “No,” said the immortal hero:

No; the ambition which leads me on, is an anxious desire and a fixed determination, to return to the people, unimpaired, the sacred trust they have confided to my charge—to heal the wounds of the Constitution and preserve it from further violation; to persuade my countrymen, so far as I may, that it is

not in a splendid government, supported by powerful monopolies and aristocratical establishments, that they will find happiness, or their liberties protected, but in a plain system, void of pomp—protecting all, and granting favors to none—dispensing its blessings like the dews of heaven, unseen and unfelt, save in the freshness and beauty they contribute to produce. It is such a government that the genius of our people requires—such a one only under which our States may remain for ages to come, united, prosperous, and free.

[Prolonged applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the following colloquy occurred:

MR. BAYNE. Will my colleague [Mr. Scott] permit a question.

MR. SCOTT. I will yield for a question, provided the gentleman does not attempt to answer it himself.

MR. BAYNE. My colleague stated a few moments ago that wheat is produced on land in Dakota, where land is worth almost nothing per acre; and that it is also produced by the farmer on lands near Carnegie Brothers' mills, where land is worth \$100 an acre. Now, if a plant such as that of Carnegie Brothers were placed out in the Territory of Dakota, will my colleague explain whether the rise in the value of the lands surrounding that plant, to \$100 an acre, would not be an advantage to the people of Dakota and to the farmer who would produce wheat on the adjacent land?

MR. SCOTT. I will answer my colleague very briefly. The value of any property is not in what it costs, but in what it will produce. I may put up a magnificent building upon which I may spend a million dollars, and yet I may have to go to the poor-house to live, so far as the income from that building is concerned. The question is, what is the value of that farm to enable the farmer to live and raise his crops?

MR. BAYNE. Or sell his land for other purposes and realize a profit.

MR. SCOTT. Suppose his land was sold under an execution by the sheriff at a loss. But my colleague must excuse me. I would give way to him, but I cannot. The House having kindly extended my time, I must not trespass upon its kindness.

HON. BENJ. BUTTERWORTH,

OF OHIO.

(Republican Side.)

No member of this House need apologize for asking and insisting upon being heard upon a question which is of such vital concern to all his constituents.

All the other bills before this body taken together dwarf into insignificance when compared with this in immediate results and far-reaching consequence.

This is the only bill pending here that reaches to every home in the country in a manner which will make its influence immediately felt. It relates to taxation—not merely to the rate of tax which may be imposed upon the citizen, but at the same time deals with his ability to pay the rate when fixed.

We are, it is hoped, at the close of the consideration of this bill, by our votes to indicate clearly—if we do not in fact absolutely determine—what, in a most important particular, the economic policy of the Government shall be. And the people in November next will approve or condemn our action; either they will commit our economic policy to the control and care of the Democratic party or restore the Republicans to power in the nation. Truth, justice, and the highest interests of the country demand that there shall be no paltering in a double sense, “keeping the word of promise to the ear to break it to the hope.”

ISSUE CLEARLY STATED.

That the people may not be misled, let the issue joined between the majority, the Democratic side of the House, and the minority, the Republican side of the House, be fully and fairly stated.

We cannot deceive ourselves if we try. We may attempt to deceive the country by presenting a Janus face in the tariff plank of a party platform. But the end to be attained, which is admittedly the good of the whole country, needs not the aid of agencies of such doubtful honesty, and more than doubtful propriety.

Let us hope, in the interest of the great cause we would serve, that the issue joined in the tariff planks of the national platforms will be so distinctly stated as to indicate that the resolution was drawn by patriotic statesmen, and not by time-serving and juggling politicians.

Whether the tariff needs revision is not the issue joined between us. Upon that point there is no controlling difference of opinion. Whether the duty is too high upon this article or too low upon that is not the line upon which we divide. Whether a rate of duty yielding a much less revenue might be so adjusted as to afford all needful protection to our industries is not the question upon which we are in antagonism. These are matters of detail, and concerning which there might be wide diversity of opinion, not only between the political parties but among the members of each. These issues would naturally grow out of conditions which affect the application of an economic policy, admitting the wisdom of the policy itself.

The controversy arises out of an irreconcilable difference of opinion between the political organizations represented upon this floor as to the wisdom and justice of the protective system. You assail it as being unsound in principle and iniquitous in its operation. We defend it as being alike wise in theory and beneficent in its results.

You assert (and each speaker who has addressed the House from the Democratic standpoint has endeavored to maintain) that to levy a duty on imports, except for the purpose of raising needed revenue, is at once unconstitutional, unwise, unjust, and indefensible, while we assert the exact reverse, insisting that not only may duties be levied with reference to revenue, but with reference to the protection of our home industries as well, and beyond that, that such duties are indispensable to the development of our national resources.

You assert, and have endeavored to prove, that the direct and inevitable result of a tariff levied for the purpose of protection, and to the extent that it is so levied, is to exact tribute of the many for the benefit of the few; that the direct tendency of the system is to found and foster monopoly, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer; that all these evil results are the legitimate outgrowth of the system, and that being so, it is the irresistible logic of the situation that if you are honest, as you are, your end, aim, and deliberate purpose must be to destroy this system.

What we account a blessing in the present system our Democratic friends condemn as a curse. It follows, therefore, that the political parties divide on the wisdom of protection as an economic policy.

In fact, we cannot deceive ourselves if we try, and I doubt if we

can deceive the country if we make the effort, as to the real obstacle which stands in the way of a proper and needed revision of the tariff.

It will not be found in the inability of this House to revise it in conformity with the just and reasonable requirements of the protective system, if that was in truth your end and aim. Nor would it be found in any unwillingness on our part to aid you in so doing. But that is not the prime object of your endeavor. The obstacle is found in the fact that your political creed demands that, while revising, you should seek to destroy.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY SEEK TO DESTROY THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

The logic of your position (and you stand by it) is that you should, if possible, while providing for needed revenue, destroy a policy which you regard as unequal, unjust, and iniquitous, and which is, you assert, the founder and cherisher of monopolies.

With your convictions upon this subject you would be untrue to the obligations of your oaths, false to the duty devolving upon you as the representatives of the people, if you did not, even as you are doing, endeavor to tear up the iniquity by the roots, and the country may rest assured if you do not succeed it will not be your fault.

It is not my purpose to discuss the details of the pending bill (that can be done when we come to consider it under the five-minute rule), but to address myself to the main question, which involves the maintenance or overthrow of the protective system.

The people of the country do not possess the discernment for which I give them credit if they fail to appreciate the precise situation presented here. They will not be misled by the cry of our friends upon the Democratic side of the House that they are anxious to revise the tariff, but that the Republicans are a stumbling block and rock of offense in the way.

The first question the intelligent voter will ask himself is, "How do I stand on the main proposition? Do I desire the maintenance or the destruction of the protective system?"

He will answer that question by his vote next November. He will say if the protective policy is beneficent it should be under Republican care, and not within Democratic control. Let no one mistake the issue. Let no one on this side suppose for a moment that our battle with the Democratic party is over the mere matter of adjusting the tariff with reference to the protection needed. This is a matter of detail. Our contest is to maintain the system against their studied efforts to destroy it. The details we will settle afterwards.

It is interesting to note with what adroitness our friends on the other side endeavor to divert the attention of the country from the real purpose which underlies and is the mainspring of their effort; as if the political ways parted when we come to consider the duty on rice, the duty upon sugar, or upon glass.

This pretended revision is the Trojan horse by means of which you hope to gain admission to our camp.

I ask you, I ask the country, if it is in the logic of the situation that you can revise, except to destroy. Will you seek to make strong or preserve in health that which you say should not exist at all?

If it should be destroyed, the work of so-called revision has been committed to those who will rejoice in the service, the Democratic party. If it is to be maintained and revised with reference to the performance of its legitimate and proper functions, this nation should place (and, in my judgment, will place) the system in the care and keeping of the Republican party.

I am conscious of the fact that we are discussing a dry subject. But we cannot be forgetful of another fact. There is not a hearthstone in the United States that will not be affected for good or ill by the passage of the Mills bill. Its passage will be a direct condemnation of the protective system. Its defeat will indicate not that the tariff is perfect, but that the Democratic party is not a fit instrument to remove its imperfections.

PROTECTION DEALS WITH CONDITIONS AND IMPARTS TO COMPETITION THE QUALITY OF HUMANITY AND FAIR PLAY.

Let us inquire what the proper functions of the protective system are, for they should not be misapprehended.

First, let it be borne in mind that it deals with conditions and not with boundary lines, except as the latter mark the presence of the former. It does not seek to destroy competition, as is asserted, but attempts to impart to competition the element of humanity and fair play, as I shall show later on in my remarks. The just measure of its usefulness will not be found in the weight of shekels it has secured to those engaged and employed in the various industries of our country.

Desirable as the accumulation of wealth was, and is, the protective system had, and has, a nobler mission than the development of the mere physical resources of this nation. That development might have been possible under a monarchical form of government controlling and employing a race of slaves.

In the course of this argument I desire to notice the points made

against the policy of protection by the advocates of the Mills bill. First, whether in its proper mission it tends to establish monopoly. Whether it does, in fact, levy tribute upon the many for the benefit of the few. Whether it does make the burden of taxation unequal. Whether it tends to increase the price of commodities in the market. And then seek to learn whether its influence has been, as we claim, to multiply and diversify industries, and how it produces those results. Whether the result has been, as we assert, to build up a home market and to continue it and in the same connection inquire into the relation of the agricultural industries to those of the manufacturer, and see how far the assertion that farmers are bearing more than their share of the public burdens are borne out by the facts.

I wish to consider also the influences which have tended to cause disturbance in the ranks of wage-workers and set capital and labor by the ears. In connection with these inquiries I will call attention to the influence of the two systems in the States where they each bear sway, and determine the value of the philosophy by the results of adherence to the practice it enjoins.

What gave rise to the protective system?

This House and the country need not be told that it was the purpose of our fathers, in the establishment of the government we enjoy, to lay the foundation of a new order of things, which looked not alone to the development of the material resources of this country, but to the moral and intellectual growth of each individual citizen; in this latter growth, rather than in the development of the material resources of the country, our fathers recognized the true foundation upon which to build a nation's greatness, and permanently secure the freedom and prosperity of all our people. And as a logical result it was their active concern to provide the opportunity for the head of each family to bring to his home prosperity, comfort, and happiness, the legitimate offspring of intelligent effort guided by virtue.

In this work the fathers built even better than they knew.

The maxims of the English law—the spirit of the English constitution wherein it was a bulwark of freedom—they adopted. But in their effort they kept steadily in view the fundamental idea of establishing a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.” They were conscious that the homes of a country are the source of its greatness and power; that as we multiply the number of homes where virtue and intelligence exert controlling influence we increase the happiness of our people, and make sure and fast the pillars which uphold the state.

BETTER HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE AND INCREASED HAPPINESS.

Our fathers realized that a philosopher placed in the midst of poverty and squalor will gravitate toward vice and corruption. They knew, and we realize in as full a sense, that as needful comforts and conveniences abound in a home, so are the inmates of that home elevated and refined, dignified and ennobled.

Our system of Government has no higher or nobler mission than to multiply the number of happy homes in the United States. Can laws perform a better work than to place the wage-worker of my country above and out of the influence of those conditions in the Old World which in a large degree tend to make men and women mere beasts of burden? Can a system of political economy be justly condemned which seeks to enable the man who produces the wealth of a nation to become, with his wife and children, the sharer in and partaker of the fruits of his toil? This is the mission of the protective system.

I contend that the preservation of that system as an economic governmental policy is to-day and must be for years indispensable to the national prosperity; and that it must be preserved as a system.

Now, does it perform the service we claim for it?

You say it imposes burdens in that it increases taxation without corresponding benefit. We answer that it imposes the shadow of taxation that we may enjoy the substance of substantial prosperity.

A careful examination of the circumstances which give rise to the imposition of so-called tax as an incident of the protective policy, and the resulting increased ability of the citizens to pay it, will satisfy even my honored friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (and that would seem to reach the case and condition of my other friends from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas) of the wisdom and justice of the policy.

With great respect I submit to those honorable gentlemen that they stop their investigation when they have viewed what they regard as the burden of tax imposed by the tariff.

They seem not to consider the increased ability to pay, which results from the influence of the trade regulation of which the alleged tax is an incident.

If it is admitted, as claimed, that the system imposes taxes, the answer is that such a tax is in the nature of an investment, the resulting profit being such as each year to repay with usury the capital invested.

If I am right in this, can you successfully deny the wisdom and

justice of the policy which in the last analysis is but a governmental business venture in the interests of all our people? The issue joined between us is as to whether we shall change our business method. An inseparable attendant on our present governmental business policy involves the imposition of duties levied for protection. And I repeat that under our system these duties are levied as plain business investment and with confidence that the capital will be returned to each citizen with usury.

PROTECTIVE TARIFF NOT A TAX.

But is it true to say that in maintaining a protective duty we lay a tax upon our people? We do not, in strictness, do any such thing. The exact business proposition resolves itself into this: In the interests of our people we have adopted certain regulations in restraint of import trade with foreign nations. If our citizens trade with the citizens of those nations they do it under and in accordance with the regulations prescribed. These laws of trade and commerce in their operation have two objects in view: one, to raise the revenue to defray the expenses of the Government; the other, to so regulate the admission of foreign products to our home markets as to secure our citizens against the disastrous influence of that foreign competition which unrestrained would greatly hinder if not absolutely prevent the establishment and maintenance of industrial plants in the United States.

We say that whatever, if any, of temporary inconvenience our people may suffer from these trade restrictions is more than compensated in the direct advantages which will result from their influence in the encouragement of productive effort among our people. We assert, and the proof of the correctness of the assertion is ample, that under the influence of this restraint of trade with foreign nations our own resources will be rapidly developed, our industries multiplied and diversified, and that the comforts and conveniences of life will more abound; and concurrently with all this, wages will be advanced, while the cost of things needful in life will be reduced. A home market, confessedly the most desirable, will be created, the industrial independence of the Republic secured, and prosperity and happiness come and abide with us.

Although the results have conclusively justified every hope and expectation of the champions of protection, yet we have to-day, as if the experiment were new and untried, to stand here and defend it. They (I refer to these misguided Democratic brethren on the other side) insist that our prosperity has not been the result of the protective system, but has come to us in spite of it. We are asked the

question a thousand times each campaign, and it has been in substance repeatedly asked during this debate: Does protection protect? I propose to add my answer to those of my honored friends on this side who have preceded me.

FIRST PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH WE BUILD.

First, let us agree on certain admitted facts and business propositions which are so self-evident as to be properly ranked among the axioms which guide the business world in the prosecution of its various ventures.

The safety and permanent endurance of a nation rest in largest measure upon the intelligence and virtue of its citizens.

That country is most independent which is possessed of the greatest supply of the things needful in peace and essential in war.

That economic policy is best which utilizes in the highest degree the widest range of material resources, and all the powers and faculties of the human mind.

The business propositions may be stated thus:

Manufacturing plants could not be established without capital. Capital will not seek investment without reasonable hope of adequate return.

Both capital and plants were essential to the procurement and employment of skilled workmen, and all these are together the foundation upon which must rest prosperous trade and commerce, since they furnish the source and supply of that which is the subject-matter of both.

Capital will protect itself, even if it has to leave the workmen in idleness and consequent destitution.

In a contest with workmen, capital has the advantage. This is certain, and for the reason that capital can wait longer for a dividend than labor can for a breakfast.

I want to supplement these cold business maxims by a few others that are leavened with the humane and Christian spirit of our free institutions. One is that labor should have its full and equal distributive share in the profit resulting from its joint effort with capital.

To authorize or permit a condition or system which would compel capital either to withdraw from the field of competition or withhold from labor its due is alike inhuman and directly at war with sound public policy. I shall maintain that the protective system is designed to, and in its operation does, avoid the evils we would shun and multiply the blessings to which we would attain,

DOES PROTECTION PROTECT, AND HOW?

Does protection protect? Palpably it so regulates trade and commerce with foreign nations as to shield our industrial enterprises from the destructive influence of conditions beyond the sea, in the presence of which the healthful growth of the industrial arts in our midst would have been impossible, and for reasons so obvious and so frequently cited on this floor that to repeat them would seem needless. They relate to the character of the competition.

Does protection multiply our industries? No, not directly; but its influence is the parent of conditions which give rise to the multiplication of our industries. It is the immediate cause and source of multiplication and diversification of industry. Just how, I will state in a moment.

By multiplication of industries we mean the creation of those that are new; such as the creation of a new method of performing a given labor, as in making horseshoes by machinery instead of by hand; printing by the use of the power-press instead of by hand; in the use of cyclones to reduce and pulverize substances instead of using a mortar of stone or iron crushers. In these and other instances we manufacture the machines to do the work instead of doing the work itself with our hands. And these instrumentalities are the product of new industries in all the mechanical arts.

And in the invention and production in the arts of these new machines and devices our industries are multiplied and diversified indefinitely, and, as a result, employment is given to vast numbers of men, women, and youths, who at once create and supply a home market.

All this Mr. Calhoun, in 1816, standing in his place upon this floor as the champion of the protective system, with prophetic vision saw and distinctly pointed out to the House and the country. I shall refer to his evidence later on in my remarks.

Now, I want the attention of my distinguished friend from Texas, with whom I have had many interesting talks as to the source of the multiplication of our industries.

I have on previous occasions called the attention of this House and the country to the influence of the inventive genius of our people upon its industrial development.

I have said, and do still maintain, that in that inventive genius will be found the germ of our unequalled industrial prosperity. And just at this point I anticipate the question of my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mills], who has in his bill placed the ax at the root of the tree of protection. He will ask me, if the multiplication

of our industries is so largely due to the genius of invention, "Why do you give protection the credit for it and continue the policy?" The idea being that since invention multiplies and diversifies our industries, and the letters patent which for a term of years vest in the inventor and his assigns the exclusive ownership of the thing invented, and so preserves to him the exclusive right to manufacture, use, and sell the invention covered by the letters patent, a protective tariff is needless.

On its face the point seems strong, and in the argument is well taken, if the scope and influence of the patent system is as broad and full as is supposed.

But I assure the gentleman that a more careful investigation of the character of our industrial growth as it rests upon the development of the mechanical arts will tend to greatly modify his views, if it does not radically change them.

I have said what is axiomatic, that to have industrial plants we must have capital; to have capital there must be reasonable promise of adequate return from its investment, and both capital and plants are essential to the employment of skilled workmen.

To procure and retain competent skill certain wages must be paid to the workmen. In this country the wages paid must be such as to enable the workmen to live in a manner worthy of and necessary to an American citizen.

To state all this in a few words, capital will not be invested in new plants if the competition from foreign countries is of such character that, to secure a profit or avoid a loss, the manufacturer must either rob his workmen or quit business. As between the two alternatives the American manufacturer will retire from business, or rather refuse to make the investment. He will not rob his wage-worker in order to compete with foreign rivals. The result is that, unless he is protected against the influence of that kind of competition which outrages humanity to make profit, our people must either remain out of certain lines of industry, or, being in, retire.

PROTECTION AND COMPETITION MULTIPLY AND DIVERSIFY INDUSTRIES.

The influence of competition is two-fold. First, it fixes the selling price with relation to the cost of production; second, it stirs into action the inventive genius which seeks to provide a better article or a cheaper method of producing the old article; and each new and useful improvement in the art tends to one of the results mentioned, to wit, a better article or cheaper method.

Thus, invention may form the base of a new industry, as the invention of the sewing-machine, a mowing-machine, a reaper and

mower, and the like. These are absolutely new industries, and may become, by virtue of letters patent issued to the inventor, the exclusive property for a term of years of the inventor.

And right here my friend asks me what need there is of a protective system, since the multiplication of industries depends upon the inventive genius and the thing invented becomes the exclusive property of the inventor. Is not the letters patent sufficient protection?

I answer, No; and will state succinctly the reason. If my friends will reflect a moment they will observe that nineteen out of every twenty of the improvements for which letters patent are issued do not evidence the creation of what I have described as a new art, but cover some improvement in the art. That is, the improvement is supplemental and tributary to the invention which lies at the base of the art.

To illustrate: An improvement in the shuttle used in the sewing-machine, valuable and useful as it may be when used in the machine, is of little consequence to the inventor or manufacturer if he finds it impossible profitably to make the machine itself.

An improvement in the device for working a sickle on a mowing machine is unimportant to a manufacturer if he cannot make the machine of which the improvement is but a supplemental adjunct.

There are in one sense few new industrial arts. There are many new and useful improved devices used in the arts—improvements of greater or less consequence in the machines and implements which form the base of a particular art.

It follows that to protect the improvements in a given art you must protect our manufacturers in the production of the implement, machine, or device in connection with which such improvements are used. These improvements are in many, I may say in most, instances compared to the importance of the machine itself in a large measure inconsequential, but still mark desirable and substantial progressive development, and supply better and more ample facilities in the conduct of human affairs, and these improvements and agencies have placed innumerable articles on the free-list. Our protective system protects the industrial arts which form the base upon which the improvements given to the world by inventive genius are grafted.

They are the foundation; these later important and supplemental improvements in part the superstructure.

So it occurs that by protecting the art, competition in our own country results, inventive genius is stirred into action, and our industries enlarged and multiplied. Thus the conditions to which our

friends on the other side would attain will be soonest reached by pursuing the even tenor of our way along the highway of protection.

The protective system upholds the art, the inventive genius perfects and completes it. Its influence is in a measure hidden, but it is none the less potent and far-reaching. Destroy the protective system and you destroy that which depends upon it. "You take my house when you take the prop that doth sustain my house; you take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

But let us turn and scan the results which should approve or condemn the protective system. It is familiar to us all that when the fathers were seeking to determine what the economic policy of the Government should be, then, as to-day, free trade and protection, as distinct economic systems, were struggling for supremacy. With reference to the protracted contest, I assert that if there was reason at any time during the history of this Republic which justified the levying of a duty for protection, so long as that reason exists so long is the system itself defensible. That is logical, and the soundness of the proposition will not be questioned.

Can any intelligent mortal entertain a doubt that a protective tariff was indispensable to the establishment and growth of our industries and the development of the resources of the nation in that which was essential to the freedom, independence, prosperity, and happiness of our people? If there is a doubter in the face of the testimony and experience of the fathers, supplemented by our own, he suffers from a weakness that is congenital, and no argument submitted here can influence his action.

Stating the proposition in another form, let me assert that which cannot be gainsaid: that if for reasons sufficient in the early history of the Republic a protective policy was judicious and humane the same system must be equally wise, just, and humane to-day if the reasons still obtain which approved it a century ago. There is no escape from this. If our fathers, for good reason, found it necessary, as confessedly they did, during the earlier period of the existence of the Republic, to invoke the aid and shield of the protective system, unless the reason no longer exists, the system which rests upon that reason, or upon the same or like conditions, should still be maintained.

CONDITIONS THAT GAVE RISE TO THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

Now let me recur to the conditions which gave rise to this system of protection, not because it is essential to the argument addressed to you, but because it may be useful to the larger audience I hope to reach outside of this Capitol.

Our fathers found our country possessed of abundance of material exhaustless in quantity, excellent in quality, and infinite in variety. Then, as now, even in our own markets, we had the world for competitors. In the face of competition then the young Republic lacked established plants, lacked the capital to establish them, was wanting in skilled workmen. They found also that American freemen must enter the field as competitors of toilers on the other side, the result of whose efforts barely enabled them to exist.

At that time, in the midst of hard lines, this latter factor in the problem (I refer to wages), which has since become the controlling one, was not so thoroughly considered; not because our ancestors were less humane or less considerate of the rights and claims of the skilled artisans, mechanics, and workmen of their own country, but the question itself was not so important then as now. The wage was the smaller factor in the problem of competition then; it is the largest and the controlling factor in the economic problem to-day.

Against the hard conditions I have mentioned the young nation entered the lists to compete for the poor favor of selling in our own markets and to our own people. Men then, as now, would exercise their right to buy where they could buy cheapest and sell where they could realize the largest price. There is no sentiment in trade. We will buy an English or a German coat for \$10 in preference to paying \$12 or \$15 to our own countrymen for the same article, though our industries perish. Buying and selling is not matter of sentiment, but matter of business.

It was clear that the result must be that if the Old World, with its established plants and boundless resources in capital, its skilled and cunning workmen, could enter the markets of the United States without the restraint of a duty imposed to regulate trade, our people would be unable to compete with the producers on the other side, even in our home market. That this was so, and is so to-day, is too clear to need argument. It was the experience of the United States immediately after the war of 1812, when England flooded our markets with goods of every kind, and to such an extent and at such low prices that the mills, shops, and factories upon this side stood idle. In the presence of such competition it could not be otherwise.

The necessity for providing against the baneful influence of this competition which paralyzed our industries, and at last tended to impoverish and humiliate our workmen and leave us helpless and prostrate in the field of industrial effort, was apparent to the men of that day who controlled the affairs of this nation.

MR. CALHOUN ONCE THE CHAMPION OF PROTECTION.

It was then that Mr. Calhoun, the representative of South Carolina, appeared upon this floor as the earnest and able champion of the protective system. He found the agricultural interests of his own State suffering in competition with India, and the fact was cited by a gentleman speaking of that competition, that it was in vain for our country to successfully grow cotton and weave cotton fabrics in competition with India where the raw material was 4 pence a pound and the wages of the laborer in weaving 4 pence a day.

It will be remembered that not many years prior to that time Whitney had invented the cotton-gin, and upon the other side the spinning-jenny and the power-loom had been given to the world by the genius of English operatives, and these agencies, going hand in hand, gave a new impetus to the growth of cotton, and under the influence of that new impetus all the Southern fields became white with the harvest.

Against the destructive influence of competition with India, Mr. Calhoun, standing in his place in the House of Representatives, advocated the imposition of a protective tariff; and a protective tariff was levied upon goods imported from the other side.

One item in that schedule levied a duty of 3 cents a pound on cotton, which was about 75 per cent. of the cost of its production by their Indian competitor.

I call the attention of my honorable friend from South Carolina, the worthy successor of Mr. Calhoun, to the language of the latter, when he stood as one of the foremost champions of the policy which his successors upon this floor so earnestly condemn and seek so eagerly to destroy.

Then Mr. Calhoun was not dealing with abstract philosophy, but was evolving a system for himself from existing conditions and facts, which refused to be ignored.

Speaking upon the tariff bill in 1816, Mr. Calhoun, deprecating the evils which would attend upon its defeat, said:

When our manufactories are grown to a certain perfection, as they soon will be under the fostering care of the Government, we will no longer experience these evils. [Evils resulting from this unequal competition.] The farmer will find a ready market for his surplus, and what is of equal consequence, a certain and cheap supply of all his wants.

It is interesting to observe that South Carolina, which leads the van in opposition to the protective system, did not always adopt this view. As I have before said, her leading statesmen in 1816 recog-

nized the importance of protecting, in a radical manner, the industries of South Carolina.

The few struggling cotton-mills of New England in the early part of this century found it cheaper to buy India cotton than to buy that produced in the Carolinas, and under the operation of that law which our friends upon the other side so constantly invoke—the right to buy where we can buy cheapest—the mill-owners of New England bought India cotton, and our merchants purchased India cotton fabrics.

There could hardly be a complaint in the Carolinas that they did not have cheap labor; but cheap as their labor was, the labor of India was still cheaper. The result was that New England merchantmen and English vessels brought from India cotton to supply New England mills and cotton goods to supply the American market. At that time certain Representatives from New England talked persuasively against an import duty, but placed their opposition on the ground of its injurious effects upon the India shipping interest, in which New England then employed forty ships. It was but a few years until our friends from south of the Potomac had gained and held the coign of vantage against the producers of cotton throughout the nations of the world, and strangely enough, after having first enjoyed the blessings of a protective system and in the midst of their own flourishing condition, turned to deny to the struggling industries of the other States the protection indispensable to their establishment and growth.

The cultivation of cotton becoming independent of all competition, the Southern statesmen turned from the championship of that industry to defend the peculiar system of labor employed in its prosecution, and from that day slavery and free trade established and maintained an offensive and defensive alliance and waged relentless war upon the protective policy. They were enabled to—as indeed they did in a large degree—dominate the country, and our economic policy oscillated between free trade and protection, and our industries had a desperate struggle for existence; and every spurt of success which came to them under the influence of war or newly-discovered gold mines was, by our free-trade friends, accounted to be the direct result of progress in the direction of free trade.

I am aware that it will be said that if conditions warranted a protective tariff in an early period, it cannot be made to appear that such conditions exist to-day, and, the reason ceasing, the rule should cease with it.

I challenge the correctness of the assertion that there has been

such change in our condition as to render the protective system of to-day defenseless.

IS A PROTECTIVE TARIFF NECESSARY TO-DAY ?

And now I desire to consider for a moment the changed conditions to the extent that there has been change, so as to determine whether in point of fact, admitting that a protective tariff was desirable in the early history of the Republic. it, on account of the alleged changed conditions, should be condemned to-day.

Without reviewing the history of our progress, we admit that we no longer are at the disadvantage of lacking established plants, nor do we lack capital; and it is but justice to my countrymen to say that as artisans, mechanics, and skilled workmen they are unsurpassed in the world. These three factors are eliminated from the industrial problem, but there remains still the fourth, the most important and controlling factor to-day; one that was inconsequential then. The plants are here, the capital is here, the skilled workmen are here, but the starvation wages are not here and in God's providence never will be here if the Republican party shall write the laws of the land. [Applause.]

The difference in wages at the beginning of the century was unimportant. The rates of duty were relatively as high then as they are now. The difference in wages paid in the Old World and upon this side was not radically different at the organization of our Government, and for some years afterwards; nor would they have been different to-day if the economic policy which controlled for a term of years, and which is seeking to control in this House to-day, had continued to bear sway.

In the prosperity upon the other side, the wage-worker—the producer, if you please—was not permitted adequately to share.

In most of the countries there during the years that have elapsed, notwithstanding his larger contribution in producing results, his wages have not been materially advanced; and it is proper to say just here that he was not and is not yet a part and parcel of the government. He had not the political power to redress his wrongs and vindicate his rights. Revolution was his only remedy.

Now mark the difference. Under the beneficent influence of our Government, of which every citizen is a part, the progress made in industrial development attests the presence in the homes of the workmen of the land better conditions and influences that are ennobling and refining.

They find opportunity for increased comforts in the fact that the prices of things needful in life have been constantly reduced, while

the rate of wages paid has been constantly advanced, mounting up 25, 50, 75, 100, and in many instances 300 per cent. above what they were when the economic philosophy of our Democratic friends held sway in the Government.

And, I repeat, capital, established plants, and skilled workmanship are not to-day the controlling factors in the industrial problem.

With us the paramount question is, shall those who contribute to our prosperity by their labor, the wage-workers, be remitted to the condition of those upon the other side of the water, or shall they continue to share, as now, in the profits resulting from a union of capital with labor in the field of productive effort?

Doubtless nine out of ten of the communications received by gentlemen upon this floor from their constituents protesting against the assault in the Mills bill upon the industries in which those constituents are employed refer to the difference in cost of production between their shops, mills, or factories and the cost of similar articles imported from foreign countries as due to the increased wages paid in the United States. In the production of the greater part of the output of our manufacturing establishments labor contributes the larger share; such contribution ranging from 10 to over 99 per cent.

There are industries which employ many skilled workmen in which 40 cents' worth of material, after being manipulated by the skilled mechanic and passes from his hands a finished product, sells in the market for as much as \$80. This is, of course, an exceptional case, but not so exceptional or extreme as many suppose. But I use it as an illustration, because it marks so palpably the point I wish to make touching the influence of foreign competition with our own skilled labor. The industry I referred to is the manufacture of the small screws and springs used in making watches.

In that industry upon the other side the wages paid range below 40 per cent. of what is paid the skilled mechanic in the United States engaged in the same employment.

It would hardly be claimed in the instance cited that a duty of 10, 20, 30, or 50 per cent. would correct the inequality between our home manufactures and their foreign competitors.

PROTECTIVE SYSTEM ESSENTIAL TO LABOR.

I have studied with care to ascertain the per cent. that labor contributes in the production of the articles supplied by our leading industries, and am satisfied that the difference which obtains between the per cent. apportioned to labor here is so much greater than that which is accorded to labor upon the other side that a carefully devised protective tariff is indispensable to the preservation of our in-

dustrial enterprises if the rights of workmen here are fairly considered and honestly provided for.

It is clear that we cannot prevent employers in foreign countries from levying unjust and cruel exactions upon their employés. They may, if they will, coin money of the bone and muscle of those who labor for them; but we can provide against the destructive influence of such competition upon our own workmen by excluding foreign goods from our market, except upon terms which shall keep far from us the conditions which are the curse that rests upon the industrial classes of the Old World.

The various objections to the protective system urged by our friends upon the other side have been fully met by gentlemen who have preceded me. The proposition that the cost to the consumer in the United States is increased in exact proportion to the duty levied has been shown over and over again by my associates to be alike untrue in fact and absurd. There is still less justice and truth in claiming that the amount levied for the purpose of protection is so much taken from the consumer and placed in the pocket of the manufacturer.

If an article costs a dollar in Italy, and by reason of a higher rate of wages here it costs a dollar and twenty-five cents, and the expense of placing the Italian article upon our market is 5 cents, and the duty imposed by our Government is 20 cents, is it not something worse than folly to claim that that duty of 20 cents goes into the pocket of the manufacturer as profit? It does go directly into the pocket of the wage-worker, and represents the difference in compensation between the amount paid the workmen here and in Italy.

Does the protective duty increase the cost to the consumer? And if so, for how long? In the first instance the cost of an article may be temporarily increased. It is not always so, but that is the philosophy of the situation. Granting, for the sake of the argument, that the cost is temporarily increased, does the end justify the means? Is it exceptional to practice self-denial and rigid economy this year in order that prosperity may abound the next? Is it not the practice of every-day life when in hard lines to suffer inconvenience to-day to secure the better condition to-morrow? Following swiftly on the heels of this inconvenience of to-day we have, as compensation, permanently reduced prices and increased prosperity as lasting as the influence to which it is due.

The experience of this nation abundantly attests that the temporary disadvantage resulting from the self-denial practiced, and which is self-imposed, compared with the consequent advantage which is born of that self-denial, is absolutely inconsequential.

TARIFF NOT AN ALLY OF TRUSTS AND COMBINES.

There has been during this debate an earnest endeavor to link the creation of trusts, syndicates, and combines to the protective policy and make it responsible for the existence of these ulcers upon the body-politic. They have no proper relation to each other, nor is either dependent upon the other, and if it shall appear that the tariff is in any instance the prop and support to any trust or "combine" formed to strangle and control the just and wholesome influences of the law of supply and demand, let that stay to the iniquity be torn away at once!

No man upon this floor shall be before me in condemnation of these organizations. I do not hesitate for one moment to assert that the most serious menace to republican institutions in this country will be found in the power and influence of aggregated capital and the pretentious insolence of overgrown wealth. And I am not alone upon this floor in the conviction that unless they are speedily throttled they will have upon the throat of the Republic so firm a grip that nothing short of revolution will compel them to relax their hold. This is strong language, but I mean every word of it. I do not stand here to condemn as moral monsters the individuals engaged in these various enterprises or organizations, for I recognize the fact that there is a vast deal of human nature in utilizing opportunities and conditions to better one's condition, increase his wealth, and extend his influence; but they are none the less dangerous to the well-being of my country that the men interested therein are reputable citizens and have not violated the letter of the law of the land.

When the bill that deals with them comes before this House, if the committee having it in charge can muster courage to report it, I shall bear witness of no doubtful import as to our duty.

Recurring again to the influence of the industrial system we are building up, it was urged, in an earlier day, and latterly as well, that the growth of our manufacturing industries tended to dwarf the manhood of those employed in them. I dissent from that proposition. I speak now of my own country.

INFLUENCE OF PROTECTION UPON EMPLOYÉS.

Let it be remembered that with the growth of our industries the opportunities for increased convenience and comforts grow with equal pace. Let it not be forgotten that the men who work in the mills, factories, and shops are potent factors in this Government, and have a voice in declaring the law which regulates the conditions

under which they labor. Their children go to school and become familiar with the duties and obligations of the citizen, and learn what the proper functions of the civil government are.

What is said as to the influence of certain employment may indeed apply to the condition of operatives upon the other side, but it can have no application to our own fellow-citizens.

ARTISANS AND WORKMEN OF CINCINNATI.

The city of Cincinnati, which, with my honored colleague, General Brown, I have the honor to represent, is known to you as a hive of industry. One or two wards in my district have within their limits a greater number of skilled artisans and mechanics than can be found elsewhere in this country upon the same amount of territory. I challenge any State or city on earth to produce rarer mechanical skill or a more intelligent and prosperous people.

These conditions are not evidenced alone in the skill and cunning shown in their several callings. It is shown in those adornments of mind and character which are inseparable from the prosperity and happiness that abound in their homes.

I will engage to go with you into any shop or factory in my district where the workmen I have alluded to are employed and select a man at random, and you will not find one who cannot read the Constitution of his country in one or two languages, or who does not understand the rights it secures and the obligations it imposes. Go with him to his home. In that home you will find not merely the ordinary comforts and conveniences of life, but also the incontestable evidence of education and refinement. Books and music will be found there. The daughter of that household will be found not only equal to the discharge of the duties which pertain to housewifery, but taking her place at the piano she will discourse the rarest music from Wagner, Beethoven, and other masters in that science. Upon the walls you will find paintings which are the handiwork of members of that family. There will be found worthy example upon the part of the parents, and filial piety upon the part of the children.

One other thing you will find: that the head of that family and the boys who come after him are intelligent and earnest advocates of the protective system.

I am not willing to exchange scenes and conditions such as I have described for any that can be found where the philosophy of free trade bears sway and shapes the industrial policy of the people.

COMPARE RESULTS OF FREE-TRADE PHILOSOPHY AND THE INFLUENCE OF PROTECTION.

I need not cross the water for the purpose of pointing out the influence of the policy of free trade and all that appertains thereto, and that of the protective system. Our own country furnishes abundant evidence by which we can reach a correct and just conclusion.

I propose, in no invidious spirit, but in simple justice to the people I represent, and in justice to the people of this whole country, to present to the House and to them some comparisons as to the progress made in the several States in everything that goes to make up an enlightened and progressive civilization.

There are certain States which make relentless war upon the protective policy, and certain other States which as constantly defend it, and are seeking to defeat the wrecking policy proposed in the Mills bill.

It has been plainly intimated time and again upon this floor that those employed in the mills, factories, and shops of the manufacturing States, and especially in New England, are in a measure robbed. That is not the language used, but is the logic of what is said. I propose to ascertain how far the facts sustain the assertion and find where the most conclusive evidence of prosperity and happiness is to be found.

I shall not stop to examine merely the manufacturing interests of the country, but will look into the condition of every industry and calling which has relation to the prosperity of the section where it is carried on.

Our friends upon the other side have appeared especially anxious in regard to per cent. of wages paid.

I hope I may be pardoned for occasionally referring to the "Buckeye" State, and certainly no gentleman upon this floor should feel less pride than I do in that Commonwealth.

We can say to the East and South, "We are your children; our parents brought with them to Ohio the characteristics of your people. If we have achieved a measure of success you can rejoice at it, for we are your children."

We turn to the West, and there we find the sons and daughters of Ohio, the brothers and sisters of our people. Our prosperity is but an evidence of the greatness and strength of the whole country.

I recur again to the matter of wages, and call attention of my friends upon the other side to the startling fact that the "Buckeye" State alone pays in wages to the workmen employed in the manu-

facturing industries prosecuted within her border \$6,000,000 more than is paid to all the wage-workers employed in the thirteen States, Delaware, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia. Yet these States have an aggregate population of nearly 15,000,000, while Ohio has a population of 3,193,000. A fact not less important is this: that while those States pay to those employed but \$270 per capita, Ohio pays \$333.

The following is the showing in detail of the total wages paid in the States named:

States.	Wages paid.	Population.
Delaware.....	\$4,267,000	146,608
West Virginia.....	4,313,000	618,457
North Carolina.....	2,741,000	1,399,750
South Carolina.....	2,896,000	995,577
Georgia.....	5,266,000	1,546,180
Florida.....	1,271,000	269,493
Alabama.....	2,501,000	1,362,505
Mississippi.....	1,193,000	1,131,597
Louisiana.....	4,360,000	939,946
Texas.....	3,343,000	1,591,749
Tennessee.....	5,255,000	1,542,359
Kentucky.....	11,658,000	1,648,690
Virginia.....	7,425,000	1,512,565
Total.....	56,419,000	14,591,475
Ohio.....	62,104,000	3,198,062

I am aware that honorable gentlemen will answer, "But the States you mention are not manufacturing States." So it would seem from the showing, but whose fault is it that they are not manufacturing States? Can you give any good and sufficient reason why the iron has slept in your mountains undisturbed during the last century?

Why does your coal remain in the hills undug?

Why is it that the water in your rivers runs listlessly to the sea, bearing upon its bosom little commerce and turning no wheel of industry?

Is it our fault that the waters of the James, the Alabama, the Cumberland, and the Kentucky do not turn as many wheels of industry as the waters of the Connecticut and the Merrimac, and those which flow in the rivers of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the West? [Applause.]

It is not because nature has not been prodigal in giving to you all the resources in raw material essential to great industrial progress. The reason must be found in your adherence to that philoso-

phy which is evolved from ideal conditions and hypothetical facts, and shuts its eyes to accomplished results.

But, you say, the same economic system obtained in all the States. That is true in theory, but not true in practical experience.

The States where the philosophy of free trade was supreme have not recovered from the paralysis resulting from its influence, and the course and conduct of the adherents to that philosophy have been in strict accord with its teachings.

The result is before us. That paralysis which excluded manufacturing from the States mentioned antedates the war, and its influence lingers there still, but let us hope will give place in the near future to a more healthful condition, the result of a wiser economic policy.

The object-lessons I place before you to-day should be conclusive alike against your philosophy and your practice. [Applause.]

I call attention now to the cities of the Union where various industries are carried on, and also to the States as a whole, to ascertain the ratio of persons employed and the rate of wages paid per capita. Here is the exhibit.

The comparison is between several cities to which I now call attention:

CINCINNATI.

Population	256,000
Total number of persons employed in manufacturing industries	54,530
Males	39,000
Females	10,495
Youths	5,035
Total wages paid	\$19,554,000.00
Per capita	\$358.50

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in every 4.

CHARLESTON.

Population	49,984
Total number of persons employed in manufacturing industries	2,146
Males	1,788
Females	150
Youths	208
Total wages paid	\$669,000.00
Per capita	\$311.03

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 23.

LYNN, MASS.

Population	31,050
Total number employed	12,420

Males.....	8,894
Females.....	3,489
Youths.....	37
Total wages paid...	\$5,833,000.00
Per capita.....	\$469.00

Ratio of employed to population, 1 out of every 2½.

LOWELL, MASS.

Population.....	59,475
Total number employed.....	20,039
Males.....	9,218
Females.....	9,503
Youths.....	1,318
Total wages paid.....	\$5,997,000.00
Per capita.....	\$294.20

Ratio of employed to population, a little over 1 in 3.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Population.....	503,000
Total number employed.....	79,414
Males.....	62,431
Females.....	12,185
Youths.....	4,798
Total wages paid.....	\$34,653,462.00
Per capita.....	\$436.30

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 6.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Population.....	351,000
Total number employed.....	41,825
Males.....	33,980
Females.....	4,761
Youths.....	3,084
Total wages paid.....	\$17,743,532.00
Per capita.....	\$424.45

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 8.

BOSTON, MASS.

Population....	363,000
Total number employed.....	59,213
Males.....	39,810
Females.....	18,150
Youths.....	1,253
Total wages paid.....	\$24,924,000.00
Per capita.....	\$421.75

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 6.

BENJAMIN BUTTERWORTH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Population.....	868,000
Total number employed.....	185,527
Males.....	113,025
Females.....	56,818
Youths.....	15,684
Total wages paid.....	\$64,265,000 00
Per capita.....	\$340.75

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 4.

LAWRENCE, MASS.

Population.....	39,151
Total number of persons employed.....	16,719
Males.....	7,819
Females.....	7,908
Youths.....	992
Total wages paid.....	\$5,549,000.00
Per capita....	\$331.75

Ratio of employed to population, 1 out of every 2½.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Population.....	216,000
Total number of persons employed.....	9,504
Males.....	7,666
Females.....	1,286
Youths.....	552
Total wages paid.....	\$3,718,000.00
Per capita.....	\$391 00

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 22.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Population.....	104,857
Total number of persons employed.....	22,891
Males.....	16,500
Females.....	5,125
Youths.....	1,716
Total wages paid.....	\$9,464,110.00
Per capita.....	\$413.50

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 4.

RICHMOND, VA.

Population.....	63,600
Total number employed.....	13,047
Males.....	9,218
Females.....	2,872
Youths.....	1,957

Total wages paid.....	\$3,206,456.00
Per capita.....	\$214.00

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 4½.

AUGUSTA, GA.

Population.....	21,891
Total number employed.....	1,680
Males.....	867
Females.....	511
Youths.....	302
Total wages paid.....	\$448,825.00
Per capita.....	\$267.75

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in every 13.

DUBUQUE, IOWA.

Population.....	22,254
Total number employed.....	2,903
Males.....	2,619
Females ..	292
Youths.....	92
Total wages paid.....	\$1,339,730.00
Per capita.....	\$461.50

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in every 7.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Population.....	123,758
Total number of persons employed.....	17,448
Males.....	13,480
Females.....	2,829
Youths.....	1,139
Total wages paid.....	\$5,835,545.00
Per capita.....	\$334.55

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in every 7.

It will be observed that the ratio of women and youths in the cities in the States advocating the protective system is greater than in the free-trade States, showing a wider range of opportunity; but what is still more significant, the ratio of those employed to the whole population is still greater. For instance, Cincinnati employs 1 in every 4; Charleston, 1 in 23; Boston, 1 in 6; St. Louis, 1 in 8; Philadelphia, 1 in 4; New Orleans, 1 in 22; Lowell, Mass., more than 1 in 3; Richmond, Va., 1 in 4½.

Passing from the cities to the States, the showing is more palpable against our free-trade friends. The showing is as follows:

Compare Wisconsin with North Carolina:

NORTH CAROLINA.

Population	1,400,000
Product of manufactories.....	\$20,095,000.00
Per capita.....	\$14.00

WISCONSIN.

Population	1,315,000
Product of manufactories.....	\$128,255,000.00
Per capita.....	\$97.00

MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS.

Missouri:

Population	2,168,000
Product of manufactories.....	\$165,386,000.00
Per capita.....	\$73.00

Illinois:

Population	3,078,000
Product of manufactories.....	\$414,865,000.00
Per capita.....	\$131.00

VIRGINIA AND MICHIGAN.

Virginia:

Population	1,512,500
Product of manufactories.....	\$51,781,000.00
Per capita.....	\$34.00

Michigan:

Population	1,637,000
Product of manufactories.....	\$150,715,000.00
Per capita.....	\$92.00

OHIO AND GEORGIA.

Georgia:

Population	1,542,000
Product of factories.....	\$36,440,000.00
Per capita.....	\$23.00

Ohio:

Population	3,198,000
Product of manufactories.....	\$348,298,000.00
Per capita.....	\$108.00

NEW JERSEY AND MARYLAND.

Maryland:

Population	935,000
Product of factories.....	\$106,800,000.00
Per capita.....	\$114.00

New Jersey:

Population	1,131,000
Product of factories.....	\$254,380,000.00
Per capita.....	\$224.00

IOWA AND MISSISSIPPI.

Mississippi:

Population	1,132,000
Product of factories.....	\$7,518,000.00
Per capita.....	\$6.62

Iowa:

Population	1,625,000
Product of factories.....	\$71,045,000.00
Per capita.....	\$43.00

RESULTS IN AGRICULTURE COMPARED.

But to make the showing more complete, and, as you doubtless claim, and possibly with justice, to equalize matters, we will turn to agriculture; but, unfortunately for tariff-reform philosophy, the showing is no better. Take Ohio and Georgia:

OHIO.

Number employed in agriculture, in round numbers	397,500
Product of farms, exclusive of live-stock and farming imple- ments.....	\$156,777,000.00
Population	3,198,000
Per capita.....	\$394.00

It is proper to add that there are 247,200 farms, which will indicate that there are employed as wage-workers or renters 150,300.

GEORGIA.

Population	1,542,180
Number employed in agriculture.....	432,400
Value of farm product, exclusive of live-stock and farm imple- ments	\$95,913.00
Per capita.....	\$155.00

Take Missouri and Illinois:

ILLINOIS.

Population	3,077,871
Number employed in agriculture.....	436,370
Value of product exclusive of live-stock and farm implements..	\$203,980,000.00
Per capita.....	\$476.00

MISSOURI.

Population	2,168,380
Number employed in agriculture.....	355,300
Value of product of farms, exclusive of live-stock and farming implements.....	\$95,913,000.00
Per capita.....	\$270.00

Take Alabama and Wisconsin:

ALABAMA.

Population	1,202,505
Number engaged in agriculture.....	380,630
Value of farm products, exclusive of live-stock and farm imple- ments.....	\$56,873,000.00
Per capita.....	\$149.00
Number of farms.....	135,864
Number of acres tilled.....	18,855,334

WISCONSIN.

Population	1,315,497
Number of persons engaged in agriculture.....	195,900
Value of product, exclusive of live-stock and farm implements	\$72,780,000.00
Per capita.....	\$370.00
Number of farms.....	134,322
Acres tilled.....	15,353,118

COMPARISON OF FARMING IMPLEMENTS AND LIVE-STOCK.

But possibly our free-trade philosophers can show better results in live-stock and farming implements and machinery. These are evidence of progressive development as they may appear ample or otherwise.

Here is the showing. Take Georgia and Michigan, the population of which is about the same.

GEORGIA.

Population.....	1,542,000
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$5,317,000.00
Live-stock.....	26,000,000.00
Total value.....	31,317,000.00
Per capita.....	\$20.00

MICHIGAN.

Population.....	1,637,000
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$19,422,000.00
Live-stock.....	55,720,000.00
Total value.....	75,140,000.00
Per capita.....	\$45.00

IOWA AND VIRGINIA.

Virginia:

Population.....	1,512,500
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$5,495,000.00
Live-stock.....	25,953,000.00
Total value.....	31,448,000.00
Per capita.....	20.00

Iowa:

Population.....	1,624,615
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$29,372,000.00
Live-stock.....	124,715,000.00
Total value.....	154,087,000.00
Per capita.....	94.00

NORTH CAROLINA AND WISCONSIN.

North Carolina:

Population.....	1,400,000
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$6,078,000.00
Live-stock.....	22,415,000.00
Total value.....	28,493,000.00
Per capita.....	20.00

Wisconsin:

Population.....	1,315,497
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$15,647,000.00
Live-stock.....	46,508,000.00
Total value.....	62,155,000.00
Per capita.....	55.00

WEST VIRGINIA AND NEBRASKA.

West Virginia:

Population.....	618,457
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$2,700,000.00
Live-stock.....	17,742,000.00
Total value.....	20,442,000.00
Per capita.....	15.00

Nebraska:

Population.....	452,402
Value of farming implements and machinery.....	\$7,821,000.00
Live-stock.....	33,444,000.00
Total value.....	41,265,000.00
Per capita.....	91.00

ARKANSAS AND CALIFORNIA.

Arkansas:

Population.....	802,525
Value of farm implements and machinery.....	\$4,637,000.00
Live-stock.....	20,472,000.00
Total value.....	25,109,000.00
Per capita.....	31.00

California:

Population.....	804,696
Value of farm implements and machinery.....	\$8,448,000.00
Live-stock.....	35,500,000.00
Total value.....	43,948,000.00
Per capita.....	54.00

SHOWING OF CARPENTERS AND BLACKSMITHS.

Among the very important artisans and mechanics and workmen in every well-ordered community are the carpenters and blacksmiths. Business activity with them indicates the presence of those comforts and conveniences which are inseparable from healthful progress. For the edification of our friends, in order to evolve all the philosophy possible from known facts and existing conditions, I present the work done in the several States by these useful members of the community. The showing in the several States is as follows:

States that favor protection.

States.	Product per capita.	
	Carpentering.	Blacksmithing.
Kansas.....	\$1.81	\$0.83
Maine.....	.62	1.82
Illinois.....	1.92	.98
Michigan.....	1.07	.94
Minnesota.....	2.21	.98
Nebraska.....	2.14	.87
New Hampshire.....	2.47	1.37
New Jersey.....	3.53	1.07
New York.....	3.82	1.23
Ohio.....	1.51	.95
Pennsylvania.....	1.90	1.01
Vermont.....	.48	1.57
Wisconsin.....	1.13	.20
Connecticut.....	4.98	1.17
Indiana.....	1.01	.98
Iowa.....	1.40	.96

Anti-protection States.

States.	Product per capita.	
	Carpentering.	Black-smithing.
Alabama	\$0.27	\$0.18
Arkansas25	.26
Delaware	2.14	1.01
Florida33	.21
Georgia53	.31
Kentucky93	.67
Louisiana49	.36
Maryland	3.88	1.01
Mississippi15	.15
Missouri	2.32	.98
North Carolina16	.16
South Carolina33	.19
Tennessee42	.45
Texas41	.46
Virginia56	.40
West Virginia34	.42

INVENTION STIFLED.

But let us search again for evidence that the influence of your philosophy has been beneficent in results.

I submit that there is no higher or better evidence of an enlightened and progressive people than is found in the product of their inventive genius. Our fathers wisely provided for the encouragement of scientific research and progress in the mechanical arts, by giving to authors and inventors for a term of years the exclusive ownership of the new and useful products of their hands and brains. No other source has been more fruitful in valuable contributions to our present prosperous and happy condition. How has the seed sown where your philosophy has had the ascendancy borne fruit? Is it rich in authors or inventors? What is the grand total of results in these two fields of labor?

Again, I call the "Buckeye" State forward. Let her record disclose what the genius of her people has supplied to the national growth in the industrial arts. Here is the record for the fourteen years immediately preceding January 1, 1885: Number of improvements in the arts, etc., by Ohio, as evidenced by patents issued, 15,065. Now, place by Ohio's side Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia, fourteen sovereign States. Altogether, during the same period, they have contributed in new and useful inventions only 14,887.

What is the matter, gentlemen? Do not those who adopt your philosophy desire the better ways and happier conditions? Or does

its presence stifle the genius of invention, even as it retards your progressive development in the fields of enterprise to which we have called attention?

WORSE AND MORE OF IT.

But let us continue our search to find some justification for your abiding in the faith which is so palpably condemned by the works which are the evidence of its influence. Possibly in the field of literature and journalism you will fare better. We shall see.

If it will not be deemed utterly immodest, I will call Ohio forward again, bringing with her Illinois, a younger sister, and they together shall show you what they have done in the direction of distributing intelligence among the people. The comparison is instructive, and may in part, at least, explain why Ohio and Illinois have stood by the protective system, and why the States with which they stand in comparison have opposed it.

Under the caption "Number of newspapers mailed to subscribers or news agents by publishers and news agents" we have the following exhibit:

Alabama.....	4,037,332
Arkansas.....	3,606,356
Delaware.....	1,141,348
Florida.....	1,141,452
Georgia.....	15,355,288
Kentucky.....	17,443,296
Louisiana.....	6,645,152
Maryland.....	9,670,232
Mississippi.....	3,334,604
North Carolina.....	6,235,372
South Carolina.....	4,376,480
Tennessee.....	12,620,712
Texas.....	12,066,756
Missouri.....	46,128,784
Virginia.....	8,639,384
West Virginia.....	3,762,980

Total of the sixteen anti-protection States.....	156,203,516
--	-------------

Now Ohio and Illinois:

Ohio.....	72,125,560
Illinois.....	87,128,444

Total.....	159,254,004
------------	-------------

Showing difference in favor of these two protection States, Ohio and Illinois, of 3,050,488.

But peradventure publications of a higher order, which evidence more recondite learning and philosophical research, have flourished better. Let us examine.

Under the classification "Number of magazines and other periodicals mailed to subscribers or news agents by publishers and news agents" we have the following exhibit.

Ohio is so closely identified with all the other States, being bound to them by all the ties of consanguinity and common interest, that I feel that with characteristic reserve she may stand up again for comparison.

Here is the showing:

Alabama.....	26,700	South Carolina.....	8,820
Arkansas.....	23,352	Tennessee.....	553,008
Delaware.....	19,260	Texas.....	21,818
Florida.....	420	Virginia....	361,056
Georgia.....	651,336	West Virginia.....	6,948
Kentucky.....	100,656		
Louisiana.....	24,888	Total number in 16 anti-	
Maryland.....	193,512	protection States.....	3,890,352
Mississippi.....	1,932	Total number issued in Ohio	6,498,216
Missouri....	1,865,784		
North Carolina.....	30,864	Difference in favor of Ohio..	2,607,864

It is written, "Show me thy faith without thy works and I will show thee my faith by my works." I have presented to you and to the country the works which are evidence of your faith, being born of it; and have likewise testified to our faith, proving it by the works we have shown. "By their fruits ye shall know them." You walk in the letter of your faith; we in the spirit of ours. "Verily the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." [Applause.]

THE SHEPHERD AND THE SHEEP.

I was interested to hear my honorable friend from Indiana [Mr. Bynum] talk about sheep. He seemed to derive great satisfaction from the number of sheep he found to the square mile in the countries of the Old World.

It is a peculiarity of his philosophy that it takes more satisfaction in the condition of the sheep than in the prosperity of the shepherd. His concern is about the sheep, ours about the shepherd that tends the sheep. [Laughter and applause.]

In the nations that challenge his special admiration the sheep wear the fine coats. Here it is our purpose to clothe the shepherd, if need be, at the expense of the sheep. But protective philosophy cares for the flock-tender, and, per consequence of that, for the flock.

The statement, however, shows that the progress made here

under the influence of the Democratic system does not compare favorably with the later period when Republican policy maintained the ascendancy. Let us see.

The increase of wool under the tariff compared to increase during the preceding years:

Between 1850 and 1860 increase 14.7 per cent.

Between 1860 and 1870 increase 66 per cent.

Between 1870 and 1880 increase 147 per cent.

Nor is this increase in aggregate pounds of wool alone to be considered, but the further fact that the weight of fleeces increased as follows:

In 1850 average 2.3 pounds.

In 1860 average 2.7 pounds.

In 1870 average 3.5 pounds.

In 1880 average 4.4 pounds.

And the showing is equally satisfactory in regard to the development of woollen manufactures. Here is the exhibit:

	1850.	1860.	1870.
Establishments.....	1,817	1,260	2,891
Hands.....	34,895	28,050	80,053
Capital.....	\$26,671,000	\$30,862,000	\$98,824,000
Wages.....	7,168,000	9,808,000	26,778,000
Materials.....	24,912,000	36,587,000	96,433,000
Product.....	43,542,000	61,895,000	155,405,000

A showing that should set at rest the clamorous cry that from 1850 to 1860 were the years of our country's greatest prosperity.

Now I turn to the pig-iron industry, and I apologize for seeming, for a single moment, to usurp the throne of my honored friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley].

From 1810, when the yield was 54,000 tons, to 1860—fifty years, during which time you were endeavoring to put your hands upon the throat of the protective system, and had it there most of the time—the product grew only to 821,000 tons. While from 1860 to 1880—only twenty years—it grew to 3,855,000 tons.

OUR COMMERCE—UNEXAMPLED GROWTH, FOREIGN AND INTERSTATE.

One would naturally suppose from the assaults made upon the protective policy that its influence had been to restrict our commerce, international and interstate; that our exports and our imports had fallen off, and that domestic interchange of commodities was oppressed and dwarfed. The exact reverse is true. They have both grown with unexampled rapidity.

In the period of pronounced protection, dating from a time when the system was recognized and established as an economic policy to be maintained, our exports and imports have grown beyond anything of which the country had knowledge before, except that our exports of specie have been reduced, and that because we have paid our debts abroad with the products of our factories and fields, keeping the gold and silver in the pockets of our people.

This is true of our foreign commerce and true of our local and interstate commerce. Gentlemen speak of the necessity for free interchange of products—that our protective system has impaired that freedom. This was uttered time and again by my honored friend, Mr. Wheeler, of New York, in our discussion in Tremont Temple, in Boston—opening his eyes to what would result from his abstract philosophy and closing them to the real facts that were under his nose; the real fact being that never in the history of the world was there such unrestricted and such enlarged commerce; never were there so many articles which were the subject-matter of commerce, nor so many instrumentalities and agencies for their free interchange as are to be found in the United States to-day as the result of the protective system.

And I say “as the result of the protective system” because the figures show that I am right, and that under the old quasi free-trade régime progressive development was handicapped, and, when not paralyzed, moved at a sluggish pace.

I here insert the figures which vindicate the correctness of my assertions, and utterly discredit the statements of my friends upon the other side to the effect that we are a suffering people by reason of the system that they are attempting to destroy.

The House and the country will observe that from the foundation of our Government up to and after the passage of what was known as the “Statute of Abominations,” which was a distinctly protective tariff as contradistinguished from a tariff for revenue, the balance of trade, in spite of the best efforts of the producers of this country, was against us until 1836; when the balance was in our favor some sixty-two millions; but it will be observed also that Democracy made all possible haste to again turn the tide in favor of foreign nations, so that on down to 1860 the balance was against us. We neither had a great home market nor did we supply the wants of our people as now; but after Republican ascendancy in the nation, and the overthrow of free-trade philosophy, prosperity came back to us in every shape, and in every form which could suggest civilized and enlightened development.

In 1860 our exports were, in round numbers, \$335,000,000, and our imports but \$373,000,000.

From 1860 to 1870, notwithstanding the great war which occupied half the decade, our exports had grown to \$420,000,000, the imports being \$432,000,000.

And in 1880 our exports were \$841,000,000, and imports \$741,000,000; excess of imports \$100,000,000.

A more important and controlling fact in this connection is that both the supply and the home market of the United States had been more than doubled during this period, nominally twenty years; in fact, considering the war, fifteen years.

The per capita of exports and imports for 1860 and 1880 is as follows:

	Per capita.
1860. Imports.....	\$1.00
Exports.....	1.11
1880. Imports.....	1.07
Exports.....	1.66

It is interesting in the presence of the showing submitted to this House, which so utterly condemns the philosophy of the Mills bill, and so eloquently pleads the cause of the protective system, to hear my honored friend from West Virginia [Mr. Wilson] felicitate himself on the fact that the column he leads is moving forward, lance in rest, to put to rout the hosts of protection.

I am glad there is some evidence on that side of the House of a forward movement. The statistics I have submitted do not indicate anything of that character.

I have no fear, however, that our adversaries will make substantial progress, but if they do, be assured it will be amid ruined industries, and a bankrupt and idle populace.

My friend said cheerfully, "We shall go forward. The people are behind us." If he alludes to the people of the sixteen States in which he musters his free-trade army, I agree to the correctness of the statement; and speaking of them, I too can say, "The people are behind us, from fifty to seventy-five years." [Laughter and applause.] And I may add that I shall rejoice if, under some happy influence, they shall come up abreast of us, so that we can march forward together to glorious industrial achievement, as suggested by my honored friend from Michigan [Mr. Burrows].

THE NEW SOUTH.

And I have the sincerest pleasure in showing to my friends from south of the Ohio that the influence of the protective system, pushing aside their philosophy, has demonstrated to them and to the

world what is possible with them under the economic policy they would destroy.

Let me show you what you have accomplished since 1880. Let me point you to the gigantic growth which you would retard and the prosperity you would destroy.

Here is the comparison between 1880 and 1888 of the progress made in the Southern States:

	1880.	1888.
Miles of railroad.....	19,431	36,736
Bales of cotton.....	5,755,359	6,800,000
Grain.....bushels..	431,074,630	*626,305,000
Farm animals.....	23,754,243	44,830,972
Value of live-stock.....	\$391,312,254	\$573,695,550
Value of agricultural products.....	\$571,098,454	*\$742,066,460
Pig-iron.....tons..	397,301	*929,436
Coal.....tons mined..	6,049,471	*16,476,735
Number of cotton-mills.....	179	294
Number of spindles.....	713,989	1,495,145
Looms.....	15,222	34,000
Value of cotton goods.....	\$21,000,000	*\$43,000,000

*1887.

Gentlemen, is there a period in your history when you made a better showing? Is there an economic policy under which you made more substantial progress? The record discloses that there is not.

NO DANGER FROM HOME COMPETITION.

One gentleman upon the other side, speaking of the progress made in industrial development in certain portions of the West and South, said to New England: "It may not be long until you will be crying for protection against the competition of the great West and South." I say to my friend, he need not be apprehensive on that score. If he will study carefully the history of his country's development and the philosophy it teaches, he will find that under our Government, situated as we are with relation to each other, one section of this country has not, and never will suffer by reason of the development of the resources, and the utilization of opportunity by another section. If it were so, and the danger to which he calls the attention of New England was even possible, long since the industries of New England and the States east of the Alleghanies would have been paralyzed, their factories and mills idle, and their homes deserted.

Why, it was only about thirty years ago that the two young States of the West, Ohio and Illinois, entered the arena as active competitors of the old States of the East. They sprang, however, at one bound into the lists, and in 1880 the two States mentioned, Ohio

and Illinois, put upon the market a greater amount in value of manufactured product than all the New England States and New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware included did in 1850. It is proper to add that the other States of the West, together with Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, and Alabama, were developing with marvelous rapidity and pouring a vast volume into the reservoir of supply.

But notwithstanding all this New England, New York, Pennsylvania and the other States mentioned pursued the even tenor of their way, every one of them enjoying unexampled prosperity in the field of productive effort. And they have in no wise complained of injury sustained by reason of Western competition.

You ask, "What becomes of this vast supply?" I call my friend's attention to the fact that the American citizen lives better than he did; has from 100 to 300 per cent. more of the necessities, comforts, conveniences, and luxuries of life. So that consumption has kept pace with production.

I have but a moment to refer to the relation of capital and labor, and can only say in that brief moment that the trouble results largely from the oft-recurring necessity for a redistribution of labor, owing to the introduction of labor-saving machinery, and the additional fact that from abroad several hundred thousand persons annually find their way into the ranks of labor in the United States; sometimes they come as contract laborers. It is clear that no other nation upon earth could admit such an army to the ranks of its wage-workers without bringing on not only temporary disturbance, but riot and possibly revolution. So we have the peculiar spectacle of prohibiting the importation of the product of cheap labor while admitting without restraint or limit the cheap labor itself.

But our country will find no advantage in shutting the door against any person who brings with him good moral character and habits of industry. He becomes at once a source of wealth and strength. But against those who represent merely a combination of stomach, appetite, alimentary canal, and bad morals it is the duty of Congress to shut the door.

So, now, I submit the question to this House and to my countrymen whether the protective system as advocated by this side of the House should be sustained. You have arraigned against it the Representatives from sixteen States, who advocate the destruction of the system and ask to be placed in charge of your industries and to dictate your economic policy.

I ask whether, in view of the ability they display in developing their own resources and founding and encouraging manufacturing,

they are well fitted to perform the office of guardian of those interests which are vital to you. Take away or withdraw from the support of the Mills bill the votes of those States that make the showing alike of indisposition and incapacity to either found or encourage industry of any character, and there will not be left enough votes in favor of the bill to pay for counting them.

I cannot close without complimenting the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Randall] for standing up almost alone in the midst of his brethren to defend the great industrial interests of Pennsylvania and the whole country, and I want to pay at the same time a tribute due to my honored colleague [Mr. Foran] and my friend from New Jersey [Mr. McAdoo], and some other Irish-Americans, who while in the Democratic ranks (where they have no business to be) refuse to become the allies and servants of English manufacturers in doing for the United States what England has done for the island where sleep the bones of their Irish ancestors.

HOW IRISH-AMERICANS AID ENGLISH FREE TRADE.

If there is any one man beneath our flag who has less excuse than another for voting the Democratic ticket it is the Irish-American.

A few years ago I read in the London Times these words, in speaking of the Irish people: "The only time that England can use the Celt is when he emigrates to America and votes for free trade" [laughter and applause], which, I may add, he has been accustomed to do, in that he has voted the Democratic ticket. But I trust that day has passed, and that Irish-Americans will not, while striking down English power with one hand, uphold it with the other.

One word and I have done. In instituting the comparisons between the different States of this Union, no gentleman upon the other side can fairly or truthfully say that my course is prompted by any possible spirit of sectionalism.

I shall be glad when every State south of the Ohio and the Potomac shall give evidence of the material prosperity which blesses the State that gave me birth. That patriotism is indeed narrow which fails to rejoice in the prosperity of the whole country.

And I say to my honored friends from the Southern States, the time is fast coming, and indeed now is, when the iron in your mountains shall awake, and, throwing off its earthy shroudings, shall find its way to the furnaces and mills, to the haunts of trade and commerce, and the fields and shops of industry, and the prosperity which your philosophy has kept far from you will, under a different system, come to bless you beyond your fondest dreams, God speed the day! [Long-continued applause.]

HON. SAMUEL S. COX,

OF NEW YORK.

(Democratic Side.)

I had not intended to take part in the general debate upon the tariff. I intended to reserve what thoughts were pertinent to its details when it came up for amendment in the committee. But for certain references of a personal nature to myself I would have refrained.

For my own choice I have the honor to have in charge the Census and Apportionment, which are of more importance, and I may say dignity, than any mere temporizing with our fiscal or economic system. The reports of the census form the basis not only of all argumentation, but of all just legislation in connection with our finances and economies; and therefore my time and strength have been devoted to laying the foundation of those returns which are authentic, and have reference to our entire country.

Properly to deduce conclusions on these topics, our lawmakers should build upon these foundations.

In the long and exhaustive debates which have occurred during the past few weeks, members have not been loth to draw upon the census of 1880, which for completeness and pertinency has no comparison with any former census, or the census of any other land.

TARIFF A BUSINESS QUESTION.

The regulation of our system of taxation, whether internal or by customs duty, is a matter of business. It is not a subject for mere party discussion, much less for personal recrimination. It does not depend on the platforms of parties, nor the utterances of our statesmen, so much as on facts collected with careful heed by the officers of the Government.

The member who approaches the subject of the tariff with a view to making party capital will have more or less of bias, and cannot reach conclusions satisfactory to the general interest.

LABOR, CAPITAL, AND LAND.

What is business? It is the adaptation of means to an end, the employment of three factors for the general and individual welfare of the people. These factors are labor, capital, and land. Any legislation which shackles in any way these wealth-producing forces is, in its very nature, tyrannical and unjust. It is the result of discriminations and combinations in which the interests of the people suffer.

According to reliable estimates the next census of the United States will show 64,500,000 inhabitants. It will reveal an immense decennial increase over former periods, certainly much greater than that between 1860 and 1870, when it was only 22½ per cent.

Of these factors, the first to be reckoned is capital. We do not lack for capital. But it may well be considered whether capital, in later years, has had equitable and contented distribution, and how far our taxing system has contributed to this end.

We have one and a half millions of arable land, scarcely one-quarter of which is in cultivation. Three hundred and twelve thousand five hundred square miles produce all our grain, hay, cotton, sugar, rice, and garden vegetables. We are enlarging our proportion of cultivable and pasture lands rapidly, not only by our inward growth, but by our immigration. Our mines of gold, silver, copper, and coal are only the auxiliaries of our boundless and varied acreage. It must, indeed, be a comprehensive system, depending upon a wise adjustment, which would deal with our richly-endowed landed inheritance.

In spite of certain forms of monopoly which are fixing themselves upon our land in the shape of cattle kings, railroad grants, and absentee landlordism, we are comparatively free from the feudality, primogenitive succession, and other aristocratic and exclusive privileges of other countries.

ENLARGED MARKET INDISPENSABLE.

With such an outgrowth in the last century as we have obtained, are we not rapidly becoming dependent upon a market beyond the limitation of our tariff laws? In fact, is not the home market a barrier against the supply to and the demand of other nations? Why should this flood of good things be dammed in its passage to other countries with whom we might exchange? Why should it be flung back upon us to destroy and be destroyed?

These are questions which press upon every farmer in the land, and upon every manufacturer who has not the fortune to be combined in a "trust."

ENLARGED MARKET FOR OUR CRUDE MATERIALS.

Our crude product forms the bulk of our exports, but should we not be warned by the increasing land products of other countries—Russia and India and South America—that any restriction against foreign trade becomes a self-imposed restriction upon our own.

SURPLUS THE PRINCIPAL QUESTION.

The Ways and Means Committee have responded to the urgent message of the President with as much wisdom as is possible under the circumstances of our industrial system. All the philippics hurled at the President return upon his revilers. What he said in his pointed and emphatic message was imperatively demanded by the extortions which filled the Treasury. The wrong he exposed was multiplying, in his judgment, into a brood of wrongs. The Treasury had become a hoarding-place for money needlessly drawn from the people. Its withdrawal from the people was bad, then, in December, 1887; it is worse now. It menaces our future. It invites public scandal. It stimulates public plunder.

One of our Ohio Democratic statesmen, Governor William Allen, used to say that it was as hard to run a powder-house in hell as an honest government with a plethoric treasury. [Applause and laughter.]

Where is the relief? Five ways are proposed:

1. To keep on hoarding? This is only a continuance of the peril.
2. To spend it? This is the remedy of my friend from Indiana [Mr. Browne], who points out many good and many wild schemes and largesses for a spendthrift Congress. To this I am opposed.
3. To pay the debt? This is being tried with the undue bonds; with what result? The last purchases which have enhanced those bonds show. The President warned us of this remedy as inviting the payment by the Government of an increased premium; and the facts already more than justify his apprehension.
4. To deposit the money in banks for use by the people? Against this, too, he warned, and wisely so. For one I will never consent to foster "any fateful alliance between the banks and the Treasury," or any "reliance in private business upon public funds." It is of the very essence of Jacksonian principle to divorce the Federal fisc from private enterprise.
5. To substitute for the 4 per cent. bonds due in 1907 a bond bearing less interest, say $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and pay to the holders money equal to the present value of the difference in interest, or rather to exchange bonds at a fixed premium. It is a safe investment for a

man or a government to invest in his or its own notes or bonds. Perhaps this plan is the best next after reducing taxation.

6. The last proposition is the one before us. It is the

REDUCTION OF TAXATION,

internal or otherwise. Who can be harmed by the reduction of a burden? It may be a necessary burden, in so far as it pays for our security under government; but still is it not a burden? Its relief should be sought, and it should be consistent with the only proper object—revenue, not for hoarding or extravagance, but for unavoidable expenses.

I do not design to argue at length the nature of this burden. I am now, as ever, convinced that such a tariff as we have not only brings about serious conflicts between labor and capital but is responsible for the high prices of manufactured goods; that it depresses the labor market, and that it fosters trusts and combinations. In fact, every tariff from 1879 down to the present time, in so far as it was protective, injured both farmer and laborer, making farming less profitable in order to make the cost of labor to the factory cheaper.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

In remarking upon the tariff in 1882 I was very frank to contend that I would forego the opposition which I made to a resolution for the abolishment of the excise system. I was willing then to forego that opposition on the basis of a resolution which I offered in the House, and which is there quoted. But I desired to abolish the internal-revenue system only as a system or mode of collection, not as to the taxation of certain articles. I was willing to see the tax collected by the States. I think now, as I said then, that it would have worked like a charm. The protectionists were not, however, in favor of reducing taxation by the tariff, but they were in favor of a hasty riddance of the whole internal-revenue system and its Federal mode of collection. I regarded the tariff which we sought to revise as a monument of war necessity and of subsequent treachery. It was promised to be reformed after the war when the internal taxes were reduced on home manufactures.

I then inveighed against the Federal administration of the internal-revenue law and favored its abolition, because of its cumbrous, corrupt, and spying system. Its officers were then in the habit of pursuing the offender into his cigar and tobacco shops, and into stills, breweries, and factories, with threats and promises, in order to

influence the voter in favor of the administration. Thanks to Democratic economy, that army of five thousand has since been decimated. Worse than the janizary or the mameluke, it undertook by its occult machinery to intimidate and defraud; and I was willing to do away with it in the Federal system, as every speck of it on our body-politic was then a cancer.

There has been no time since the discussion of the tariff of 1864 when economic measures were before Congress that I have not protested against their excesses, and have given the reason, which has been verified, and that is that they would engender a surplus, which was both corrupting to legislation and administration. At all times I have been willing to cut down the taxation to avoid this peril. I was willing to welcome any relief from this surplus. But since we could not tear away the octopus which was preying upon the people in the indirect form of taxation, I was even willing to take the direct form and thrust it one side, and the more so because it was in the hands of the Republican party, who were using its emissaries and officers for an espionage not only in New York City, but elsewhere, for sustaining their corrupt practices and perpetuating their supremacy.

But this bill is before us. It concerns more a surplus than it does a tariff. The surplus is the principal object with me; the tax but the incident. If I cannot apply the reduction at one point, I will to another; but for the present I believe that the committee which reports this bill, considering all the varied industries of this country, have done the best possible with a view to successful accomplishment of the great object—the reduction of taxation, so as to avert future accumulations and avoid the paralysis of business.

THE BILL NOT A RADICAL MEASURE.

This bill proposes very little. The wonder is that so much noise has been made because of what it does propose. In round numbers it takes off but about \$78,000,000—\$54,000,000 from the tariff, and \$24,000,000 from internal taxes. It adds to the free-list some articles of necessity, so as to reduce the cost of their manufacture and that of the commodity itself.

The present average of the tariff on dutiable goods is 47.10 per cent. This bill, if passed, would leave it 40 per cent., and leave it still an enormous burden on production.

NOT A FREE-TRADE MEASURE.

Call this bill a free-trade measure! Why, it leaves the average duty higher by 10 per cent. than under the law of 1862, which was a

thorough war measure. Before the recommendation of the Tariff Commission it should hide its head, for that commission recommended 20 per cent. reduction, which would have left the average less than will be left if this bill becomes a law.

If this bill be not passed and the matter is committed to the discussions of the forum, where the people can hear homely and plain discussion, no one can tell the result when next it comes before a renovated Congress. [Applause.]

OPPORTUNITIES AND ARTICLES TO REVISE.

There are various articles from which a revenue could be wholly or partially dispensed that would benefit the whole community, and with least injury to our manufacturing interests.

The amounts collected from these for the year ending June 30, 1887, are as follows:

Sugar.....	\$50,000,000
Tobacco.....	30,000,000
Alcohol used in the arts.....	12,000,000
Tin-plates.....	5,700,000
Low-grade wools.....	5,000,000
Chemicals, etc.....	4,000,000
Flax, unmanufactured.....	2,400,000
Lumber.....	1,000,000
Salt.....	700,000
Coal and coke.....	600,000
Iron ores.....	700,000
Clays.....	85,000

I should have been very willing, were there no other alternative, of taking off of this list the revenue proportionably, or almost in any way, to prevent the menacing accumulations in the Treasury. From any of these articles, especially sugar, tobacco, lumber, wool, coal, and salt, which are used by the masses more than almost any other, I would, in an emergent condition of our business, be willing to make reductions. Salt is a necessity for our dairymen, and used by our meat and fish packers. Coal is indispensable to our factories. Lumber should be free for building purposes, and we should as a sanitary measure save our forests. Chemicals should be free, as free as the raw material of our woolen fabrics. Besides, the relief of chemicals would benefit our soap and other manufacturers. And alcohol should be free, because used in the arts and manufactures; their relief would be a boon to many of our lesser industries. A great relief would be given also in the matter of clothing, because at least 50 per cent. more for clothing and blankets is paid in this

country above that paid in other countries. Here are the percentages of taxation on several articles which are necessities, and from which some selections for relief might be made:

	Per cent.
Tax on sugar.....	80
Tax on rice.....	112
Tax on salt.....	83
Tax on corn starch.....	93
Tax on potatoes.....	45
Tax on woolen dress goods costing 22 cents a yard.....	71
Tax on common cloth.....	91
Tax on woolen hosiery.....	70
Tax on flannels.....	73
Tax on common woolen shawls.....	87
Tax on cotton hosiery.....	45
Tax on cotton bagging.....	54
Tax on plain earthenware.....	55
Tax on window-glass.....	86
Tax on plate-glass.....	147
Tax on steel rails.....	80

Doubtless, in the finality of this bill, when it comes to a conference, considerations of this nature may be paramount, but for the present, whether this bill is amended or not to suit my views or that of my constituency, I will give my vote, heart, and mind to its passage.

MAXIMS OF TAXATION.

Writers on political economy have laid down maxims which are almost classical for the accomplishment of taxation. These are developed by John Stuart Mill, in his Fifth Book and second chapter, to be:

First. That the subjects of every State ought to contribute to the support of the Government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities. Otherwise it is inequality.

Second. Adjust the time and manner of the payment, and the amount of the tax, with certainty, so that the tax-gatherer should not become insolent or corrupt.

Third. The convenience of the tax-payer; among which is reckoned taxation paid by the consumer of an article, little by little, as he has occasion to buy the goods. He should be at liberty to either buy or not to buy, as he pleases. In this he pictures our own tariff system. And fourth, which is more to our purpose in this discussion, that every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and to keep

out of the pockets of the people as little as possible over and above what it brings into the Treasury.

Under this head is discussed the diversion of a portion of the labor and capital of the community from a more to a less productive employment; and in this, too, he speaks appropriately as to our own system.

But above all there should be equality as the rule in taxation as in all other affairs of government. [Applause.] The sacrifices which taxation requires should be made to bear as nearly as possible with the same pressure upon each and all. It is equality of sacrifice. It means the apportionment of the contribution of each person toward the expenses of the Government. This standard is one of perfection. It cannot be completely realized, but it is necessary in discussion to know what perfection is. In other words, if we cannot in a debate of this kind find out the absolute truth and the perfect theory, we can do as the mariner does at sea when he loses his compass or his reckoning—he can sail by a star, if he cannot sail into a star. [Applause.]

These maxims may seem abstract. They may be placed within the category of doctrine; but I hold now, as I have ever held here, that there can be no practicalness in our legislation unless we deduce it from, or find it crystallized in, correct theory. The sneer against scholastics and *doctrinaires* comes from ignorance of the very philosophy of economy and legislation.

The same law of induction by which Lord Bacon, after experiment, generalized applies as well to political as to physical science. It has been said that Lord Bacon in his *Novum Organum* made possible the discovery of the circulation of the blood, the steam-engine, electric motors, and all those forms and forces of invention which have changed the industries of the world, and given to civilization its advancement. It is only when these laws are violated that man retrogrades, or if he does not retrograde he simply marks time and does not march.

In all commercial transactions between two foreign countries the basis of exchange must be specie and the currency of the countries reduced to their par values. So when a man brought a hundred dollars' worth of goods into this country he had to sell them at that time for \$174 dollars of our currency, with freight and duties super-added. That amount I ascertained by taking the cost of American gold as compared with English gold.

That state of things no longer exists. Nevertheless, by the same mode of demonstration you can find out precisely the moneyed element which enters into this tariff tax and which never goes into the

Treasury of the United States. These elements of cost upon merchandise imported from foreign countries are, first, cost abroad; second, the difference of exchange; third, the duty; fourth, freight, insurance, and other charges of importation; and fifth, the importer's profits and all the preceding items, which we reckon at 10 per cent.

Now, it is precisely at this point of cost that the imported article comes in competition with the corresponding article of the home manufacturer, and the aggregate of all the items above mentioned constitutes the protection which the tariff system gives to the manufacturer. The consumer of the domestic article, of course, pays this bounty, in addition, to the manufacturer. No man familiar with political economy pretends to dispute this axiom. No man pretends to dispute the proposition that the object of a tariff for protection is to increase the price of the article; else who would care for protected bounties? Not the manufacturer, certainly. If not he, who then?

In order to verify *a posteriori* from the facts the cost of the taxed articles in addition to the tariff, I obtained the bills of lading at our custom-houses on pig-iron, bar-iron, cotton, and woolen manufactures, etc., which will be found in the Globe of June 2, 1864.

I was almost afraid in that debate to show what the cost and bounty of these articles were when they reached the consumer. It was almost incredible, especially when aggravated by a depreciated money system.

Of eleven principal articles imported from abroad upon this basis, and reckoned upon the basis of standard gold currency of the United States, I could not resist a conclusion that there was an average of over 60 per cent. in the shape of a bounty to home manufactures. And I deduced this conclusion:

Think of it! For the iron which we use in all its varieties of adaptation; for the cotton we wear, whether printed or plain, in the calico dress or the shirting; for the wool in blanket, carpet, or clothing; for the newspaper, book, and pamphlet; for the leather we use when tanned or manufactured into boots and shoes; for the clothing we buy already made up; for the soap and candles and India-rubber goods,—for these only under our tariff of 1862, and not counting our recent increase or the proposed increase of this bill, we pay as gratuity to one class of persons the enormous sum of \$750,250,252.

Will any one pretend that all this is for revenue? What! when the tariff does not raise one-tenth of that sum on all articles of importation? What, then, is this \$750,250,252 paid for? Not for war, not for debts, not for ex-

penses. Is it possible that we have to pay on some ten articles only, in paper money, \$750,000,000 to get less than \$50,000,000 of revenue from them?

I use these figures simply to show the method under the tariff of 1862, and not for the purpose of showing what the present tariff, with its 47 per cent. duty, levies upon the people; but to show the immense sums paid by the consumer which never get to the Treasury of the United States, but go as bounty to the home manufacturer.

Deducting the 60 per cent. for depreciated paper money, then, on the amount thus ciphered as bounty on the articles named, and you have, to get \$50,000,000 into the Treasury, a bounty of \$300,000,000. This is a stupendous outrage. [Applause.]

Is not the President, therefore, correct as an economist and wise in his foresight as a statesman when he says:

That the tariff renders it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers of certain articles which are protected and taxed to sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid the customs duty? So that it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people who never used and never saw any of the foreign products purchase and use the things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles.

But how small is his reckoning of the amount which never sees the Treasury which is a part of the tax upon the consumer. He says that those who buy the domestic article pay a sum at least approximately equal to the duty to the home manufacturer. If I am correct, the sum thus paid is five or six times the amount of the duty. [Applause.]

CHEATING BY STATUTE.

It will not be doubted that it is an under-statement, that to get \$200,000,000 into the Treasury it costs \$1,000,000,000. If this be not accepted as true, then go to the custom-houses and inquire for the bills of lading. When you find out the fact as I did, you will not wonder at the diabolism of the tariff; you will not wonder that the father of all sin and lies is the father of the tariff. [Laughter.] Members grow indignant at the percentages levied on the necessities and the immunity on the free-list of luxuries; but they grow reconciled when it is known that these sums go to carry on government. They are reasonably content with them, even though they create a surplus and endanger values and credits. But this is not the head devil in the business. Our tariff makes horns and hoofs free, while it taxes the Word of God. The devil is in that, but only a little

devil. It is when he adds to the tax that goes to the Treasury the robberies outside that the worst begins. Do you deny this result? I give you a touchstone to test it.

We import, say, \$400,000,000 a year of the protected goods, and pay an average of 47.10 per cent. on them. Alongside in the merchant's store are the competing American goods. They are 47.10 per cent. higher than they would be sold outside of the United States. And since they are five times the value of the foreign goods, in dollars, we must pay \$5 tax to the protected manufacturer where we pay \$1 to the Government. Any woman who buys Irish linen in Cork, or a shawl in Paris, will know when she brings it in the unhappy fact. It is sometimes true, as this debate develops, that American goods are cheaper over our own borders. They have to be sold in foreign markets, and to compete they must be undersold.

The devil is never dressed up so elegantly as when he appears as a protectionist.

Oh! how is the devil dressed?

He is dressed in his Sunday best,

With his scarlet coat and breeches of blue,

But there is a hole for the tail to come through.

[Laughter.]

It is said that when the devil walked the earth in full dress he took most delight in seeing a cunning old lawyer "cheating by statute." [Laughter.] If he had only known the complicated machinery of the tariff, ad valorem and specific, mixed in his own dress, by the square inch and by the threads, he would have enjoyed far more the legislative cheat. [Laughter.]

A FORM OF TYRANNY.

And now, I ask, where under our Constitution; where, by the laws of nature; where, by the laws of Providence, is the warrant to thus violate the rights of property? Governments may seize property, the property of individuals, by mere arbitrary act. This, says Dr. Wayland, is a form of tyranny with which all the nations of Europe of old were too well acquainted.

But—

he says—

the same thing is done by unjust legislation. That is, when legislators, how wellsoever chosen, enact unjust laws, by which the property of the part, or the whole, is unjustly taken away, or unjustly subjected to an oppressive taxation.

Frequently since that time I have had occasion to pursue the same methods of argumentation in relation to these peculiar modes

of public oppression. I have learned these principles in connection with economy, not from slave-owners, or Southern statesmen, or members of the Cobden Club, but from a teacher whom I reverence and who belonged to New England. He warned us in our college days to beware when the antidote to evil became the source of evil; when society itself set the example of speculation; when public injustice became the prolific parent of private violence. He told us the result as he had gleaned it from history, to which he applied his irrefragable code of morality. That result was, that capital, immigration, and production ceased, and a nation either sinks down in hopeless dependence, or else the people, harassed beyond endurance, believing that their condition cannot be made worse by any change, rush into all the horrors of civil war. The social elements are dissolved, the sword enters into every house, the home ties which bind men together are severed, and no prophet can predict at the beginning what will be the end.

ILLUSTRATIONS FROM BAD TRANSPORTATION.

Let me make a homely illustration. I heard it in the classroom, from Dr. Wayland; and to it Mr. David A. Wells has added his own piquant observation. It refers to the interchange of commodities and to transportation. If transportation be difficult, it adds to the cost of the article to the consumer, just as a tariff or tax. Whenever you diminish the abundance of things which minister to our necessities, it is like interposing a desert, swamp, an unbridged stream, or a bad road between producer and consumer. No road at all; it is a prohibitory duty. Twenty per cent. duty is like a bad road; 30 per cent. is a corduroy road [laughter]; 40 per cent. like a broad, deep, and rapid unbridged river, and 50 per cent. like a swamp flanking the river on both sides, while 100 per cent., such as levied upon steel rails, blankets, and window-glass, is a band of brigands who strip the merchant of nearly all he possesses. He should be grateful to God that he escapes with his life. [Laughter and applause.]

LOCAL INTERESTS.

I do not complain of gentlemen desiring to help their local interests. Truly it requires a little sacrifice to vote for the general weal when it causes a particular home woe. Local color in art gives grace to picturesqueness. Our polity has as a presiding genius autonomy. Let us respect it, but let us not carry it to such excess as to make the removal of general wrongs impossible. Statesmanship should study how best to reconcile the jarring and diverse industries of our extensive land.

Members admit that there are certain productions that upon principle should not have protection; but they declare that they will make reprisals for the clamors and exactions of the tariff in other matters where they are unprotected. I have inveighed against this system as mutual brigandage and the reciprocity of robbery. [Applause and laughter.]

Our tariffs illustrate them in every paragraph. Kentucky wants cheap copper stills for her whisky. She gets even with the Michigan robber by demanding a tariff on hemp. Now hemp is to be on the free-list, and why not copper? Maine steals on lumber to make up for the Massachusetts roguery on fabrics.

Massachusetts howls for cheap coal; Pennsylvania says, no; and so Massachusetts goes out with a Home Market Club and knocks down the West and South, to rifle them of half their gains on raw cotton. Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina, being fleeced all round in clothing, sugar, and what not, go for goobers at a cent a pound. [Laughter.] California demands a large reprisal for her lumber, because she is fleeced on salt by New York, West Virginia, Ohio, and Michigan. The Gulf States form a band of brigands, and march forth with precious little hope for any steal worth the powder; but being reduced to extremities, they call on Fra Diavolo from Louisiana to lead against the robber gang of cut-throats on cotton-ties and trace-chains. Pennsylvania, the Robert Macaire of the lot, steals boldly on all articles from a plate glass to a locomotive; and to make up for the general loss, the Northwest masks herself behind her forests and demands timber reprisals; and so on. Nothing is sacred. Even the corsets of Connecticut, around which hover so many happy associations [laughter], or the brier-wood pipes of Knickerbocker are not safe from the interchangeable piracies of the tariff. [Laughter and applause.] Oh, the beauty of reciprocal rascality! [Laughter.]

IS IT ROBBERY, OR WHAT?

Gentlemen seem to take umbrage because we call these tariffs which take from one class to give to another robbery. But I have the best ethics for the statement that the right of property is violated by the individual by cheating, stealing, robbery, or violation of contract; and universally, just as these crimes prevail, production languishes, industry diminishes, and the richest soil fails these few and impoverished inhabitants. But when Government lays its powerful grip on the property of the citizen to bestow that property on favored enterprises, it is none the less robbery because done under the forms of law.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Butterworth] says it is not a tax, only a "trade regulation." [Laughter.] In this he differs from every writer upon political science. I am inclined, notwithstanding the euphemism, to call it otherwise. [Laughter.] The suave expression "trade regulation" sounds pretty, but it is all the same a tax and something worse.

IS IT BURGLARY?

But stop! I should apologize. I must be decorous. [Laughter.] It is not robbery. Since the tariff forces taxes from one person to give to another by indirection, by a sleight-of-hand manipulation, is it not merciful to call it by another name than robbery? Ah, sir, it is done in the night season. [Laughter.] It is done against the defenseless victim when he or she is asleep and in their homes. Some folks would call it burglary. [Laughter and cheers.] But I must be parliamentary. [Laughter.] Therefore I call it a trade regulation. [Laughter.] I have read a volume by M. Huc, a Catholic priest, who, dressed in the yellow robes, traveled through Thibet. He made many graphic descriptions of the then strange land of the Grand Llama. Among other descriptions (I quote from memory) is that of an adventure in the Thibetan mountains.

AN EUPHEMISM—"TRADE REGULATIONS."

A brigand meets the priest upon the road. The brigand does not point a pistol at his breast nor draw a knife. He says with perfect courtesy:

"Venerable elder brother! It is cold to-day in the mountains. I would like the loan of thy cloak."

And again:

"Beloved friend, dost thou not see that I am tired with walking? Thy horse, if thou pleasest."

This is a "trade regulation" in the land of the Grand Llama! [Great laughter.]

But the great bulk of our tariff larcenies is done in the night season; and if Dr. Wayland and other writers be correct beyond a cavil, these unequal, unlawful, and outrageous taxes are flat burglary. I beg pardon—I use again the language of my friend from Ohio, used in this House, and not in Canada—it is not even taxation. It is a little trade regulation by which Ohio is made magnificent and prosperous at the expense of our Southern brethren.

SUN AND COAL.

Gentlemen complain that this bill is a radical bill to ruin our industries. How can this be so? Why, the sun and its kindred elements are regarded as aliens against which we must have protection and prohibition. Coal is left off of the free-list, although ready to drop into our ships from the cliffs of Nova Scotia, to give caloric to the factories of New England.

I once had occasion here to improve upon one of Bastiat's fables so as to apply it to our country, but I did not then know that the story had a basis in fact. M. Rouviere, late prime minister of France, in a speech in 1882, I think, said that the tallow chandlers of France—good, kind, simple protectionists—petitioned the chamber of deputies to suppress gas. Why? Because it would ruin their business.

With this new light I beg to repeat the analogue, with my own comments, and to print Bastiat's petition as an addendum to my remarks.

M. Bastiat's petitioners desired to suppress sunlight. They were protectionists of the genuine type. They demanded that the authorities should close all windows and sky-lights, inside and outside, all shutters, curtains, blinds, bulls'eyes, openings, chinks, clefts, and fissures whereby the sun enters to the disadvantage of the manufacturers of wicks, snuffers, street-lamps, extinguishers, and the producers of oil, tallow, resin, and alcohol. [Great laughter.]

"No cheap and plentiful light from abroad for us," they cried. [Laughter.] Let us have petroleum against the external competition of daylight. Light is an uppish, solar foreigner, and should not rival the coal-gas from Pennsylvania. [Laughter.] Light is alien. It is cheap, pauper labor. [Laughter.] It inundates us half the time. Your Joshua is a protectionist. [Laughter.] He would have it stand still that coal and gas be high-priced. [Laughter.] The market for gas, candlesticks, and gas-burners should not be disturbed. Oh, no! For is not light a secret enemy, purchased with foreign gold? [Laughter.] Quench it, and artificial light will be gorgeous and bountiful, though dear. How many domestic industries does not the prism destroy? It saps the foundations of agriculture, for is not tallow from the sheepfolds of my friend from Vermont [Mr. Stewart]? [Laughter.] It destroys the oil market, plugs the gushing wells, and interferes with transportation. It throws out of employment workmen innumerable; it reduces the wages of such as are left. Under this policy of free light, what becomes of what is left of the whaling

industries of New England? Who protects the heroes of the harpoon? The very bronzes, glidings, crystals, lamps, and spacious saloons of the rich are useless half the time because illumined by the proximity of the sun.

Let us build an opaque roof, ribbed with steel, over the land. [Applause and laughter.] What matter the expense? Every American coal-bunk and American mine will furnish the material for an American-made gas-retort. No gratuities of nature, no natural wealth. Give labor a chance. [Laughter.] Let manufacture thrive. Down with the sun! Imprison electricity! Up with old chaos and darkness! And while cheap foreign labor is forbidden in its products at the custom-house forget not also to bar out from Castle Garden the cheap foreign laborer who comes thither with light in his eye and iron in his blood: for is not light and iron an alien to the protectionist? [Applause and laughter.]

PEANUT INDUSTRY AND THE SON OF AFRICA.

The raiser of peanuts, by a parity of reasoning, protests against the free importation of that article. It is consumed by my little Arab constituency of the Bowery. [Laughter.] I must regard them. Because the same article is raised by those whose cheap labor is evidenced by the clothesless condition under Afric's burning sun—let peanuts be protected! Why not? The same philosophy applies to the salt made abroad by solar radiance and evaporation. The sun is a cheap laborer, and although we have a sun shining over our own Onondaga in New York, it has not the calorific properties and chromic results of other suns, in other lands, which have laid away vast mines of these saline crystals in the bosom of the earth.

There is coal, too. Why should it not be protected or restricted from abroad? Is it not the product of the sun and nature?

THE SUN, CARBON, AND LOCOMOTION.

One Sabbath George Stephenson saw a train flashing by with its long white plume of steam. Turning to his friend, he said:

"Can you tell me what is the power driving that train?"

"Well, is it not one of your big engines?"

"Aye, but what drives the engine?"

"Oh, very likely a canny Newcastle driver."

"What do you say to the light of the sun?"

"How?" asked the friend.

"It is nothing else," said the engineer. "It is light bottled up in the earth for tens of thousands of years—light absorbed by plants and vegetables—being necessary for the condensation of carbon dur-

ing the process of their growth if it be not carbon in another form; and now after being buried in the earth for long ages, in fields of coal, that latent light is again brought forth and liberated, made to work as in that locomotive for great human purposes."

Was there no poetic beauty in the reality of this conception? Think of it. This sun power, equal to billions of horses, is not only every day providing fuel for some great locomotive emergency of the future, but it lifts up fabulous weights of watery vapor into the clouds, which return to bless the earth by giving form and color, fiber and juices, scent and strength, to tree and flower.

These same sunbeams, when pressed into coal by the centuries and ponderosities, and when mined and fired, become incentives to motion. They outstrip Apollo's coursers of the sun. They move the fast flying-shuttles of interchange to create the tapestry of a better civilization. [Applause.]

Why should these natural and cheap workers for human happiness be laid under embargo and prohibited to our people?

THE FRUITS OF THE EARTH—ARE THEY FREE?

The same cogency of reasoning, patriotic love of a home market, and independence of foreign supply, especially in case of war, is illustrated in a petition sent to this House by a Connecticut gardener from Glastonbury. Almost in sight of the Charter Oak his strawberry beds give their succulent rubies to the sun; and the sun, through coal and Stephenson, harnessed a force to bear them to my constituents. But the Connecticut gardener is not satisfied with this nearness to the New York market. He demands that a heavy if not prohibitive duty be placed upon all foreign fresh fruits; oranges now taxed 25 cents a box; on grapes now 20 per cent. ad valorem, and bananas—and why? Because the consumer being satisfied with cheap foreign fruits fresh from the West Indies would discourage his strawberries. [Laughter.] He would embargo the ships of all lands where currants grow, and figs and dates are sugared by the sun, in order to leave the yearning in the human oesophagus for the huckleberries of the Nutmeg State. [Laughter.]

By a parity of reasoning the anchovies and sardines of France and the raisins of Turkey should be prohibé in order to protect the Suckers of Illinois and the grapes of California. [Laughter.]

Truly, when we do begin our attacks upon nature and her processes it is hard to stop. It is the little end of the wedge for a potato, and then the result is a whole catalogue, including the gaminivorous animals, the rhinoceros, hippopotamus, and elephant, to teach the children natural history. [Laughter.]

The present bill proposes to repeal the 10 per cent. ad valorem on barks, beans, berries, balsams, birds, and bulbs. Who opposes this alliterative benefaction? On barks? Some quack who has found a root which may be ruined in the market for medicinal use. On beans? Some maker of castor-oil intended to relieve the infant industry of the home market. [Laughter.] On berries? Some batrachian of the swamp who croaks for protection to his cranberries. Balsams? But why go on? The *argumentum ad absurdum* has no limit for the revision of such a tariff as we have. Let foreign nuts, and seeds, and weeds, and "dried insects not edible," be prohibited or restricted, for is not the country rich in hazels, and hickories, garden seeds, and jimson weeds, and who knows what industries chemistry may not evoke out of these—our natural resources!

INFANT SUCTION POWER.

I am confused by the tabular opulence of our tariff speeches. We have tables on wages, tables on the home market, tables on iron and lumber, tables on cotton and copper, tables on salt and wood-screws—tables on everything. I am afraid we do not study them heedfully. I will not make any tables; but I am studying statistics. I have made a calculation about our infant industries, and their power of suction from a maternal government. [Laughter.] Skipping the era from 1846 to 1860, during the existence of a good Democratic tariff, I beg to develop some statistics. That suction power amounted to 10,441,000 horse-power. [Great laughter.] I prove it by showing the power of the fly in mechanics as a provocative to force. [Laughter.] Taking the unit of power, which is 1 pound weight raised a foot, and the power which a horse raises 33,000 pounds a foot in a minute, I thus get the one-horse power. My friend from Ohio [Mr. Butterworth], late Commissioner of Patents, will note my accuracy. [Laughter.] These are statistics. [Laughter.] Then after the manner of our protectionists, I seek the census of 1880. [Laughter.] I desire the number of horses, oxen, milk-cows, mules, asses, and other cattle. [Laughter.] They number in the aggregate 48,095,807, from Alabama to Wyoming, all within our borders. I give a period of three months of the year for fly-time. [Laughter.] Then, I demonstrate irrefragably that these livestock for about ten hours of the day keep their tails in motion. [Laughter.] I deduct as an uncertain factor the Texican steer, who uses his foot to kick vagrant flies from off of his ear [great laughter], and then I find that the forces thus expended and utilized, omitting the Texican steer, give me the premise, which I have seen somewhere in the speeches of the gentlemen on the other side, from which I

deduce the untold suction power of our infant industries! [Laughter and applause.]

Through this enormous and well-ascertained horse-power in fly-time I am enabled to gauge the amount of milk which Michigan suckles through copper, Pennsylvania through iron tubes, Massachusetts on cotton, New Jersey on spool-thread, Louisiana on sugar, Maryland on coal, New York on salt, California on blankets, Ohio on wool, and so on. Of course there is more or less struggling as to which infant should have the right of way [laughter] or the first pull at the pap. [Applause and laughter.]

It is said of the infant Hercules that when he was suckled by his mother he pulled so hard that he spilled the lacteal fluid and produced the milky way in the heavens. Hercules is Pennsylvania. [Applause and laughter.]

WAGES—SYLLOGISMS.

I do not affect elaborate tables. They are so common as hardly to be read, especially when they refer to wages under the tariff. A table may show a low scale of wages for England, and a high scale for the United States. But what does it prove? Let me reproduce here, in syllogistic form, these logical sleights of hand or mouth.

Thus argues the protectionist:

England has free trade; England has low wages. *Ergo*, free trade produces low wages.

Again: The United States has protection; the United States has high wages. Therefore protection produces high wages. [Laughter.]

Now, one may very easily parody such chop-logic, thus:

England has a House of Lords. England has low wages. Conclusion: the Lords make wages low. [Laughter.]

Or, the United States is infested with tramps. The United States has high wages. Therefore tramps make wages high. [Laughter.]

Ireland has no snakes. Ireland has low wages. *Argal*: Snakes make wages high. [Laughter.]

Apply the same argument to Russia. Russia has high protection. Russia has low wages. Therefore protection makes wages low.

Turkey—will gentlemen excuse for my reference? [Laughter.] Well, Turkey has a low tariff—8 per cent. Turkey has the Koran. Therefore the Koran makes wages low. [Laughter.]

The truth is, as has been frequently stated on this floor, and proven, that wages are a matter entirely irrelevant to the discussion of tariff, depending upon the law of supply and demand, and the circumstances, situation, and resources of the country. [Applause.]

I have discussed, very often here the relation between the

tariff and wages. I will not enter upon that further now, except to say that by the reports of our consuls, and notably the consul at Birmingham, Mr. Schoenhof, and by a comparison of tariffs and wages in other countries, it is safe to conclude that the tariff does not affect wages in the sense in which the Republicans claim it. No man can argue, however, from these relations between wages and prices and tariffs, as to the beneficial results to the people.

INVENTIONS, STANDING ARMIES, CONSUMERS, ETC.

A country like ours, which has 250,000 inventions protected by the patent law, as my friend [Mr. Butterworth] so well recognizes, and with her artisans and laborers replete with intelligence and ability, need not fear competition from nations which have withdrawn, at great cost, millions of their productive citizens for standing armies. The nations who compete with us have 1 man for every 24 of the population in the soldiery; in the United States we have but 1 man in 1,610 of the population.

HOME MARKET.

When protectionists clamor for a home market they forget that there is no standing army of consumers, but nearly all of our people are producers. They say: "We must have a home market; we must consume all we produce at home, and produce only as much as we consume."

We do produce more agricultural products than we consume by five hundred millions worth a year. How can we consume these products at home—in our country? It would require several millions more people who would consume only and produce nothing. But if more people do come in there will be more products still and a greater surplus. The proposed remedy only increases the surplus, and cannot diminish it, unless, indeed, we follow European example and keep a standing army of two millions of idle soldiery. [Applause.]

A liberal English statesman—not a Tory—Sir Lyon Playfair, speaking of this condition of our country, points to the United States as the great industrial nation of the future, and exclaims: "Luckily her protection policy is an incubus upon her industry, and gives us in England breathing time to prepare for the coming struggle."

NON-PROTECTED CLASSES.

It has often been repeated here that the last census shows that of the 17,392,099 of our population engaged in industries, 7,670,493 are employed in agriculture; and, in round numbers, about 4,000,000 in

professional and personal services, nearly 2,000,000 in trade and transportation, and nearly 4,000,000 in manufacturing and mining. At least 1,214,023 are engaged in pursuits which are not benefited but rather injured by a high tariff. They are injured, I say, because the protective tariff, which is alleged to make high wages for others, does not affect these. The pattern-makers, the bricklayers, the molders, the house-carpenters, and many other branches of business which are absolutely unprotected, command higher wages than those working on protected articles.

There are nearly 400,000 carpenters and joiners, 300,000 milliners and dressmakers and seamstresses, nearly 200,000 blacksmiths, 133,000 tailors and tailoresses, 102,000 masons, 76,000 butchers, 41,000 bakers, 22,000 plasterers, and others engaged in other unprotected pursuits, who bear the burden without receiving the benefit of the favored class.

Counting out the number of unprotected farmers, and over one-half of our entire population are dependent upon farms, I have before me a list of trades and employments, which I will append hereto. It includes over one hundred classes, from the architect to the wood-chopper, who derive no sort of consequence, but whose business is crucified between the two thieves—*ad valorem* and specific levied upon all they consume.

Here is a list of the number of our population engaged in non-protected industries:

Architects.....	3,375
Artists and teachers of art.....	9,104
Auctioneers.....	2,331
Barbers and hair-dressers.....	44,851
Boarding-house keepers.....	19,058
Clergymen.....	64,698
Clerks and copyists.....	25,467
Clerks in hotels.....	10,916
Dentists.....	12,314
Domestic servants.....	1,075,655
Employés of hotels.....	77,413
Civil engineers.....	8,261
Hostlers.....	31,697
Hotel-keepers.....	32,453
Journalists.....	12,308
Laborers.....	1,859,223
Laundresses.....	121,942
Lawyers.....	64,137
Livery-stable keepers.....	14,213

Messengers.....	13,985
Musicians.....	30,477
Nurses.....	13,483
Physicians and surgeons.....	85,671
Restaurant keepers.....	13,074
Sextons.....	2,449
Teachers and scientific persons.....	227,710
Veterinary surgeons.....	2,130
Private watchmen.....	13,384
Whitewashers.....	3,316
Boatmen and watermen.....	20,368
Book-keepers in stores.....	59,790
Canal men.....	4,328
Clerks in stores.....	353,444
Commercial travelers.....	28,158
Clerks in railroad offices.....	12,331
Clerks in insurance offices.....	2,830
Clerks in express companies.....	1,856
Draymen and teamsters.....	177,586
Employés in warehouses.....	5,022
Employés of railroad companies.....	236,058
Peddlers.....	53,491
Milk men and women.....	9,242
Newspaper carriers.....	3,374
Street-railroad employés.....	11,925
Telegraph employés.....	22,809
Telephone employés.....	1,196
Packers.....	4,176
Pilots.....	3,770
Porters and laborers.....	32,192
Sailors.....	60,070
Salesmen and saleswomen.....	32,279
Steam-boat men and women.....	12,305
Stewards and stewardesses.....	2,285
Tollgate-keepers.....	2,203
Traders.....	114,839
Dealers in books and stationery.....	4,982
Traders in boots and shoes.....	9,993
Traders in wood and coal.....	10,871
Traders in cotton and tobacco.....	22,000
Undertakers.....	5,113
Weighers and gaugers.....	3,302
Druggists.....	27,700
Dealers in real estate.....	11,253
Dealers in provisions.....	35,129

Dealers in dry goods.....	45,831
Dealers in groceries.....	101,849
Dealers in iron and tin.....	15,076
Dealers in hides.....	2,382
Dealers in lumber and marble....	12,668
Dealers in newspapers.....	2,729
Dealers in paints and oils.....	1,940
Dealers in paper.....	1,862
Bakers.....	41,309
Blacksmiths.....	172,726
Brick and tile makers.....	36,052
Bridge builders.....	2,587
House builders.....	10,804
Butchers.....	76,241
Carpenters and joiners.....	373,143
Car-makers.....	4,708
Charcoal and lime burners....	5,851
Coopers.....	49,138
Engineers and firemen.....	79,628
Engravers.....	4,577
Fishermen and oystermen.....	41,352
Brick and stone masons.....	102,473
Millers.....	53,440
Miners.....	234,228
Oil-well laborers.....	7,340
Painters.....	128,556
Paper-hangers.....	5,013
Photographers.....	9,900
Plasterers.....	22,083
Printers and stereotypers.....	72,726
Quarrymen.....	15,169
Quartz-slaters.....	4,026
Stave-makers.....	4,061
Wood-choppers.....	12,731

It is this class of people that I have the honor in large part to represent. They live in our cities, and though they may be largely engaged in manufacturing, according to our census returns, they are not manufacturing those articles which have the special favor of our tariff.

DO NOT TAX WAGES. OH, NO!

Gentlemen may tell us that they do not tax the wages of these men, whether high or low, by their tariff.

I know that they do not tax their wages; but they tax all that their wages buy. They thus reduce the purchasing power of the lit-

the money that is left at the end of the week or month; for every article that enters into their expenditure, from the potatoes, taxed specifically 15 cents a bushel, to the salt, at over 80 per cent., ad valorem, and from the rent of their houses, which is enhanced by the tax on lumber and wood-screws, to the blankets that give them comfort in the winter nights.

INSECTS IN THE TARIFF.

We have reports made by our Commissioner of Agriculture about every imaginable insect which preys upon our crops: The Hessian fly, the army-worm, the weevil, and that latest pest called *Hemiptera*, or the family of *Lygæidæ*. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] understands this family. They have "trade regulations" of their own. [Laughter.] I may say that they are familiarly known as the "chinch-bug." Efforts are being made to dislodge these pests that destroy our grasses and our grains. Much money is expended out of our surplus for that purpose. Would it not be much better for the farmer if the same amount of skill in the treatment of certain little tariff insectivora and infusoria were investigated so as to destroy them?

I am in favor of that kind of protection which is more in the nature of repeal than enactment. Where our game laws do not suffice, or our birds do not answer the purpose of destroying these pests, our reports tell us that a solution of common soap added to boiling water or kerosene will have that effect upon chinch-bugs. Let us not be particular in the nature or quantity of the remedy.

LUXURIES AND NECESSARIES.

Allow me to place in parallel columns a statement of a number of these *insectivora*. One column will show the luxuries of life, which come in free under the present tariff, and the other the duties on the articles of necessity. And yet, for years and years in this House, gentlemen have refused even to consider the advisability of reducing these taxes and harmonizing their discordant elements:

Duty on articles of luxury.

Ottar of roses, free.
Neroli, or orange-flower oil, free.
Diamonds, 10 per cent.
Raw silk, free.
Jewelry, 25 per cent.
Gold studs, 25 per cent.
Finest still wines, in bottles, 29 per cent.

Duty on articles of necessity.

Castor-oil, 180 per cent.
Linseed-oil, 62 per cent.
Common window-glass, 87 per cent.
Raw wool, 45 per cent.
Steel rails, 85 per cent.
Horseshoe nails, 116 per cent.
Cheapest mixed woolen goods, costing abroad 24 cents per yard, 77 per cent.

Duty on articles of luxury.

Finest thread lace, 30 per cent.
 Fine Aubusson and Axminster carpets, costing abroad \$2.77 a yard, 46 per cent.
 Finest India shawls, costing abroad say \$20 a pound weight, 35 cents a pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem, or say 40½ per cent.
 Silk stockings, 50 per cent.
 Finest broadcloth, costing \$5 a pound abroad, 35 cents a pound, and 40 per cent., equal to about 41 per cent.
 Pate de foie gras, 25 per cent.
 Musical instruments of all kinds, 25 per cent.
 Duty on a quart bottle of champagne, costing abroad \$1 a bottle, 58 cents.
 Curry and curry powder, free.
 Olives, green or prepared, free.
 Spices of all kinds, free.

Duty on articles of necessity.

Spool thread, 51 per cent.
 Common druggets, costing abroad 26 cents a yard, 86 per cent.
 Common woolen shawls, costing abroad 68 cents a pound, 86 per cent.
 Common worsted stockings, costing 26 cents a pound abroad, 73 per cent.
 Common cloth, costing 65 cents a pound abroad, duty 35 cents a pound, and 35 per cent. ad valorem, equal to 89 per cent.
 Rice, 106 per cent.
 Galvanized wire smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 26, wire gauge, 132 per cent.; smaller than No. 26, 155 per cent.
 Duty on a dollar's worth of bleached cotton fabric, costing abroad 5½ cents a square yard, 66½ cents.
 Potatoes, 15 cents duty per bushel.
 Corn starch, 85½ per cent. duty.
 Salt, 85 per cent. duty.

AMERICAN IDEAS, NOT FOREIGN.

Our American statesmen from the earliest days to the present who have not been wise in economy have not been accustomed to swear in the words of any masters from abroad.

In the Principles of Trade, which appeared in 1774, two years before Adam Smith wrote his Wealth of Nations, it was asserted that commerce should be as free between all nations of the world as it was between the several counties of England.

Franklin's letters of 1778 were of the same tenor, namely, that our tariff should be for revenue only. Jefferson, as minister to France, was then advocating free trade. He recommended that commerce be relieved of its shackles in all parts of the world. Gallatin opposed protection very soon afterwards in Congress.

HONEST DEFINITION OF FREE TRADE.

As early as 1831, William C. Bryant argued for the liberties of interchange, and up to the final triumph, in 1846, when the tariff, in the language of Senator Allison, was as "perfect a tariff as any we

ever had " [applause], protection had no more strenuous opposers than the men who, like Emerson, in the very midst of the war, spoke of it as in the interest of all nations.

These men did not undertake to convey the idea that free trade was the abolition of custom-houses, nor the substitution of direct for indirect taxation. In the language of a representative protectionist paper, the *Philadelphia American* of the 7th of August, 1884, they held that it meant such an adjustment of taxes on imports that the entire revenue of the country should be thus collected, and so long as it did not lay its duties in such a way as to lead any one to undertake any employment or make any investment he could avoid in the absence of such duties.

NEVADA TO THE RESCUE—THE IRISH VOTE.

The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Woodburn] undertook, as he said, to fill up a gap. He filled one. [Laughter.] He thought that the President's message was a British document, but not having the testimony on that head complete from the internal evidence of the document itself, he rushes to London and invokes the Cobden Club to his assistance. He made many apocryphal statements in relation to it, and quoted that enemy of Ireland and America—the Tory organ—the *London Times*, as evidence that the Democratic leaders of this country were horrible free-traders. He revamped the old story of British gold which is to be used in America for the Democratic party and its success. He found in the membership of the club an army of dukes, and the Lord knows who, and drew the inference that with their "three guineas apiece" they were going to subdue America and overturn the Republican party [laughter] and things generally! Goodness gracious! Whole ocean into tempest tossed to waft a feather and to drown a fly! [Laughter.] He was careful to omit the names of the distinguished Republican leaders, who are, of course, in the conspiracy against themselves! He became so confused as to the name of the Secretary of War that his mistake naturally produced "great laughter and applause," which should have been reconsidered on the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Cogswell] that it was quite another Endicott!

Among others whom he named as members of the Cobden Club were some of the most liberal men in American politics upon both sides, including the Speaker of this House and several Senators.

Now, what was the objective point of all this logical debate on the Mills bill? It was the Irish vote. [Laughter.]

The gentleman was careful to let the House know that he was

born in Ireland. Our Congressional Directory had already indicated that. But if I should pursue the method pointed out by a scientist of Dublin, Dr. McElheran, I think I could denationalize the gentleman. [Laughter.] That distinguished doctor showed that the way to test a true Celt was not by the place of his nativity, but by his features and name. The Celt has a handsome eye and a graceful figure, while the Angles and Saxons—as Defoe held—were the mud of all the races. Of course I would not apply such a remark by the author of Robinson Crusoe to the gentleman from Nevada, although perhaps he deserves it for his baseless attack upon Mayor Hewitt. Of course, since the statement as to our mayor has been refuted, he will make the *amende*. We will give him time. [Laughter.]

The gentleman may have been born in Ireland. I once heard an Irishman say, "Because a baby is born in a stable it does not follow that he was a colt." [Laughter.] It is well understood by physiologists that such men as Shakespeare and Sir Isaac Newton, by their lineaments, are ascertained to be Celtic in their origin. Cromwell and his confiscators left quite a spawn in Ireland; and some of them have claimed to be of the pure stock. But they are not. They are not the O'Callaghans, the Murphys, the O'Connors, the O'Shaunesses, and the Sullivans [laughter], of the O'Neills, whose royal lineage is honorably upheld by my friend from Missouri who sits near me. [Laughter.]

When a member makes *proport* of himself, in order to reproach others, he must take the consequences, even if they be both philological and physiological. "Wood-burn"—what does it mean and where did it come from? There never was a better Saxon word than *wode* or *wudu*; it is a wood. It signifies when an adjective "mad," "furious" [laughter], because wild animals lived in the woods of Denmark or Friesland. *Burn* is thoroughly Saxon. It is from *biernan*. I surmise that the gentle defender of Tories from Nevada was either descended, most honorably of course, from some lordly Saxon charcoal-burner, or that the name came from some of the Cromwell folk who burned all the woods they could not confiscate when they invaded Ireland.

Names are not much in a debate, but as the gentleman has spread my middle name—Sullivan—on the Record I must analyze that also a little in return, by saying that Sullivan is from the Latin "Sol" and "levant." Sun Rise! [Laughter.] My ancestor came from the East. I went back as his reflux wave. [Laughter.] I may mention confidentially that one of my ancestors carried a hod at the building of Solomon's Temple. [Laughter.] All I know of the family is that

a recent ancestor came over from Ireland with Lord Baltimore. He was in good company. I need not enlarge further.

There is another test of Celtic blood to which I may refer, as it is so pertinent to the Mills bill. The gentleman from Nevada will be pleased to know that his championship of the Tory protectionists of England indicates that he leans toward, if he does not belong to, the bluest blood of the landed aristocracy of England.

Evidently the speech of the gentleman was made for the purpose of prejudicing the Irish against the Democracy, by reason of their dislike to their English oppressors. But his arrow falls far short of the mark.

The gentleman was pleased to say something complimentary of myself as a member of the Democratic party, and referred to me as a representative of a cosmopolitan constituency in a cosmopolitan city. He spelled my name at full, and more than intimated that I became a member of the Cobden Club, a "nobleman's foreign association," as he phrased it.

This remark of the gentleman from Nevada seems to have been well received by the House. To be more exact, let me quote his language:

At the same time, to my utter astonishment, I find one of the foremost men of the Democratic party, a distinguished author, wit, and humorist, a Representative of a cosmopolitan constituency in a cosmopolitan city, Samuel Sullivan Cox, became a member of the noblemen's foreign association.

By the brackets I notice, though I did not hear the speech, that this was received with laughter and applause.

I am at a loss how to discriminate. I have no special vanity, but I suppose the applause was intended for myself as a foremost Democrat, author, wit, humorist, and Representative [laughter], and the laughter was at the gentleman's expense for associating me with noblemen, as such people run nowadays in and out of divorce courts in England.

I am not altogether certain that the gentleman should be laughed at for calling me a nobleman. I have had some sort of a decoration given to me by a descendant of the Caliphs and the Sultans. But the nobility which I most admire is not that of mere title. I have almost forgotten my honors abroad; for I did dearly yearn for the society of you gentlemen. [Laughter.] All the pride I have is to be a commoner along with other common folks here. [Applause and laughter.]

I do not care even for the word "Honorable" in this House. I have an ambition to be considered a good man and a faithful mem-

ber. I have no special desire to be considered either witty, humorous, or a *littérateur*. Whatever the House or the gentleman may have meant by their laughter and applause, I would commend to him the verse of Tennyson, where he says:

Howe'er it be, it seems to me
'Tis only noble to be good ;
Kinds hearts are more than coronets,
And simple faith than Norman blood.

[Cheers.]

And certainly no one ever merited this tribute of the laureate of England more than Richard Cobden, the yeoman's son, the friend of America, and the defender of just economic laws. [Cheers.]

When the gentleman prints my name Samuel Sullivan Cox in the Record he indicates something of my Celtic blood, but he indicates something better in my thought and service.

I beg to say that I accept my middle name with considerable pride; for among the best men of the Revolution from New Hampshire were the two Sullivans, one of whom was governor of Massachusetts, and the other a general in our army. Both were the friends of Washington. The general not only was the first to wrest Fort William and Henry from the Tory government of England, but, after the Revolution was over, he signalized his bravery and skill by suppressing the Indians in Central New York, when they were allied with the Tories with which the gentleman is pleased to be allied.

I am not so proud of my middle name as I was, for when I reflect that Boston culture has produced another kind of Sullivan, and that he ingloriously retreated from the beautiful land of France before a British foe, I am not proud to see my name parted in the middle.

The gentleman from Nevada represents a little rotten borough which is held by a lot of silver lords. From his standpoint he chooses to defame the men who made the "cheap loaf" for the poor Englishmen, and who, as O'Connell expressed it, were engaged in the same sad work toward Ireland. The attempt is as futile as the attack of a microbe against the shaggy frontlets and pachydermatous hide of the American bison recently brought to this capital. The gentleman's State is supposed to be in the Union. With its forty-odd thousand inhabitants it has as much power in the Senate as New York with its six millions. Still, should he not cultivate something of the modesty which belongs to littleness, of which I am a commendable specimen, and not be too forward in attacking men who,

like Cobden and his corn-law repealers, and as Macaulay said of the Puritans, were the noblemen of nature by the imposition of a mightier hand?

If the gentleman would produce the impression that those who have been named as members of the Cobden Club in their catalogue are unfaithful to Ireland or to America, he had better correct the Record; at least so far as my name is concerned, for not only have I defended her sons, and had passed resolutions of sympathy and of succor for the cause of Ireland and Irishmen who were imprisoned wrongfully, as the Record of this House will show, but I had the honor of making the motion, before a Democratic speaker, by which Mr. Parnell was accorded the privileges of this House for an address upon the wrongs of Ireland.

It would take more misrepresentation and innuendo than the Tory member from this rotten borough has shown to produce any impression upon the cosmopolitan constituency which I have the honor to represent.

By ancestry, by inclination, by virtue of long service here, running through nearly thirty years, I never gave one thought of sympathy with the Tory leaders who sought to drive England to desperation by their protecting policies.

The Tories of New Jersey, whence came my folk, were in alliance with the Hessian and the red-coat to drive the patriots of the Revolution into ignoble humiliation. They failed; but had this sympathy against the Liberals of England, which the gentleman stigmatizes, not existed at that time we might still have been an English dependency, and the gentleman, if he had lived at all, might have been engaged in the constabulary force in Ireland to-day endeavoring to suppress, under the orders of Tory Balfour, the enfranchisement of the people of his native isle who are seeking for home rule.

In picking out my name, had he looked over the list of the Cobden Club a little more closely he would have seen the name of Governor Jacob D. Cox, a Republican gentleman and soldier. He was an honest statesman. This he illustrated in this House, and as Secretary of the Interior. In association with such a man one can welcome such pitiful assaults as those of the Tory member from rotten Nevada.

Governor Jacob D. Cox was the friend and associate of General Garfield. They were sympathetic with liberalities of all kinds. I do not charge that either of them accepted all the tenets of the Cobden Club.

I do not understand General Garfield's relations in that way, and certainly I had no such idea. I do not know how I became a mem-

ber. It was tendered to me, I suppose, for my persistency in vindicating the liberalities of thought which belong to economic study and the observations which I have made of the working of our tariff system. The Cobden Club has other objects besides freedom of trade. It sends out pamphlets in relation to the tenure of land. It favors the removal of primogeniture. It would improve the tenure of title to land in England as well as elsewhere. It would stop the great pension-lists and other excesses of English economic administration. Publications on these themes are sent to its members. I have received my share and such instructions from them as I could glean. But it does not follow that I am bound by all its tenets, for I, too, swear in the words of no master on this subject, and no platform, and no party.

While in a foreign country I was elected a member of a society which, being translated, means Phil-Hellenic. Its object is the study and diffusion of knowledge as to ancient Greek archæology, history, language, and literature. It may have its peculiar theories about Grecian art and philosophy; but did it follow that though I accepted such an election, honorably tendered, I was bound to any particular philosophy of ancient Greece, whether that of Plato or Aristotle? Must I become a cynic or a stoic, revel in the sty of Epicurus, or my soul become transmigratory with Pythagoras? Must I accept a peculiar theory of the dative case, or adhere to the pre-Periclean or post-Periclean school of art? I was never called on to eat fish or drink cold champagne in the seat of ancient Byzantine Empire; but if I had I should have drunk to the Iliad and the Odyssey and to the swelling of the voiceful sea, which is the vehicle and symbol of liberty! I do not know what this honorable society of Greeks may do on the Bosphorus, at the seat of their ancient empire and glory, but I hope that they will do nothing that will ever be brought up in Congress to the disadvantage of my party or patriotic associations. [Applause.]

This little esprit of the gentleman, according to the brackets in the Record, produced "laughter and applause."

It is well that the gentleman got in his laughter first. The incident reminds me of another Irishman. He was in a meadow with a little bovine. The bovine began to paw the earth and tear up the ground with his horns, and the Irishman laughed and laughed at the unique performance. [Laughter.] But soon the little bull pitched him over a fence. The Irishman got up, and said, "Isn't it lucky I got in my laugh first?" [Laughter.]

Before I am through with the history of this club and its opponents and members he will be, perhaps, not a little astonished to

know where the laugh comes in; and that he has made himself the advocate of the meanest and worst of all the aristocratic and titled gentry that ever rackrented and stole the land or harassed and oppressed the people of any country. [Cheers.]

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

In this connection it is but just that we should recognize the efforts in and out of this country made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Butterworth] to reciprocate without restrictions with the Dominion of Canada. Boldly, in spite of the objurgations of his party, he cast protection to the winds, moved on Canada, and took a toboggan slide into free trade. [Laughter.] I perused his admirable speeches with eagerness to find the re-enforcement of our policy. Alas! He was one of the lost sheep to which he referred so felicitously. Doubtless he made the Canadian protected wilderness resonant with his bleat.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley], in "peeping" around for the one he left more than the ninety-nine who had not gone astray, must have been astonished to find that by leaving him alone he came home with his little protection tail behind him.

But what will gentlemen do for the lost Norse lamb from Minnesota [Mr. Nelson]? He is still wandering. No one is looking for him. He has the range of the Northwestern pastures, and I think we need not mourn over him. [Laughter.] He belongs to the hardy race who are not afraid to syllable the words and ideas of commercial liberty. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Ohio is not ignorant of the elements of reciprocity; he knows their value; he has upheld its banner. I am proud of his efforts. He applauds the Zollverein of our own Union. He would extend it not merely by interchanges with Canada, but to the other Americas. But the moment he mounts his reciprocal charger and makes our continent the scene of his chivalric endeavor, he turns his back upon other continents.

MR. BUTTERWORTH (of Ohio). If my friend had read my speech he would have found that my argument went to the effect that the protection system deals with conditions and not with boundary lines. It deals with the philosophy of economic politics without any reference whatever to geographical lines.

MR. COX. Then, of course, if that is the definition, my friend is in favor of his philosophy being extended. It means to be reciprocal with Canada. If it be good philosophy for Canada, it is good philosophy to apply to Central America and South America and Mexico,

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Undoubtedly; and wherever the conditions are the same. It is against the false conditions that destroy, where restrictions should apply, and not against the locality. The gentleman will see—

Mr. Cox. I get your idea.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. It is a good one, is it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. Cox. Yes; but it is a little remote and nebulous. [Laughter and applause.] But I think I get it.

I have not much charity for my friend from Ohio. I have for my friend from Nevada, for he does not know as much as my friend from Ohio. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio is not ignorant of the conditions in regard to reciprocity. The same conditions would bring European countries here by the aid of the vapor of water and by the telegraph.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Now permit me a moment.

Of course in this matter, and a part of my proposition was that, should the tariff fence be extended around Canada and extend the system along and around the border, they adopting the same tariff system as against the world, where different conditions prevail, should we not extend a hand to them?

Mr. Cox. I give you my hand on that. [The gentlemen shook hands.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Then we are making progress at last.

Mr. Cox. I am with the gentleman, and by the doctrine of Richard Cobden and his club, and the same doctrine of John Stuart Mill, and the same doctrine of Robert J. Walker and his tariff, I would advocate for Canada the liberality of our exchanges. I congratulate and welcome the honorable gentleman within the bosom of the good old free-trade and revenue-reform party. [Applause.] And I will give out for him, before I get through, a hymn to sing that will warm his heart so as to make ourselves thoroughly harmonious.

The gentleman from Ohio, who is a most erudite and eloquent gentleman, joined with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Symes], who is also both eloquent and learned—and, by the way, Colorado is a sort of English colony—in deprecating the Anglomania which leads members here to oppose the Tory protection party of England and Canada. I hope to see my friends' efforts bring fruit in reciprocity with Canada; and such fruit that will create wealth, content, and cordiality for both countries, as Cobden and Chevalier did for England and France, and as Cobden and Robert J. Walker did for England and America when they shook hands across the Atlantic, the one by the tariff of 1846, and the other by the repeal of the corn

laws. They thus gave a splendid aggrandizement of their respective countries. They enhanced the glory of the Anglo-Saxon race.

OHIO AND THE SOUTH.

The picture the gentleman from Ohio drew from my native State is a proud record of the achievements of her people. During this centennial season it was peculiarly appropriate; but when it is considered that her prosperity is due in part to unequal laws, there is not so much pride in the comparison he institutes between Ohio and the South. Why, let me ask, if these laws be equal—as tax laws should be in a common union—should these results be so diverse? Why boast of results which are the results of Federal disfavor to one section and favor to another? Is it fair that strength should forever aid the strong? Shall wrong hold sway forever? No, no; the gentleman following the vaticinations of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows] sees the iron which is sleeping in the sunless chambers of the southern earth awake, and through its agencies bless the South beyond their fondest dreams.

The attempt of the gentleman from Ohio to excite indignation against Democrats who were in sympathy with the corn laws, of which Cobden was the leading champion, shows that he is not yet altogether in sympathy with the men who favored that repeal.

TORIES AND PROTECTIONISTS RUINED IRELAND.

That class of men for five centuries held England in its thrall, and, what was worse, mercilessly persecuted Ireland. They were protectionists of the most intense and grasping sort. It was while these Tories ruled that they destroyed the labor of Ireland by exactions and persecutions only equaled by the myrmidons of Cromwell. They confiscated like Cromwell, but they did worse. Their protection, like that of the wolf to the lamb, struck down the linen and other industries of Ireland.

The gentleman therefore places himself in line with the spoilers of Ireland in the past centuries and with the Salisburys and the Balfours of the present. He is in sympathy with the long list of Tory ministers, from Lord North down, who have harassed and plundered that "saddest isle of the sea." [Applause.]

He places himself in so far as he can in sympathy with a party of aristocrats who, under the reign of the Georges, and the worst of the Georges—George the Third—produced the revolution which gave us independence, and who, with allies like our Indians—those hell-hounds of savage war—and the mercenary Hessians, made the early

struggles of our fathers a long conflict against all the barbaric cruelty of the Tory protectionists and landlords. He arrays himself against that Liberal party from whom the Whigs of our Revolution received their name. It was led by Chatham, Barré, and Burke in the defense of our colonies against Tory taxation and tyranny. The old Federal party was recruited, after our Revolution, from the Tories. During the war of 1812 that same Federal element sustained England against the Democracy. To-day the present Tory administration is fighting the Liberals of England and Ireland with Gladstone and Parnell at their head. They are protectionists. They drove the English people in 1846 as they are driving the Irish by every menace to their freedom and their prosperity—to the very point of starvation and insurrection. [Applause.]

LESSONS OF THE CORN-LAW REPEAL.

There are lessons here quite pertinent to the pending bill and debate. I crave your indulgence for dwelling on them.

For five centuries England blundered in fostering industry by restricting exports and forbidding imports. Her statesmen, like the Lotus Eaters of Tennyson, listened to the—

Chant of an ill-used race that cleave the soil,
Storing their yearly little dues of wheat and wine and oil.

Her arousal came with a terrific revolution, producing clamors for bread and protests against starvation.

Up until 1846, when she began to reciprocate with us, the history of her corn laws is the history of a desperate struggle unexampled in our world.

Her first effort was to restrict the imports of foreign wheat, rye, barley, oats, and maize—different species of so-called “corn”—so that she might have abundance and cheapness at home.

These early restrictions, from 1360 to 1688, were well intended. She was, during that period, an agricultural rather than a manufacturing country. She raised all the corn she consumed, and had a surplus. At that time any law against the importation of corn would have been inoperative. She was not then so foolish as to enact such laws.

We have upon our statutes some similar sops, quite as unsubstantial as they are insulting to our farmers.

But even with such legislation, she was hampering the natural force of her industry and trade. She was forming the habit of meddling and tinkering, by Parliamentary action, with the growth of her industries. She was raising up a favored class. Of course it

was done on the pretext of protection and patriotism, but it was done really for the aggrandizement of the rich landed proprietors. She built up great families and self-seeking monopolists; and this is our first lesson growing out of the corn laws. Strike out the words "agricultural monopolists," and insert "manufacturing monopolists," and leave the word "protection" stand, and you have the same combination here which throttled both commerce and agriculture there. It compelled the people to pay tribute to the lords of the land. [Applause.] In other words, it put money into the pockets of the few by crippling and destroying the industries of the many.

Then came another era of class government. It was that of an internal protective system. It was a system of bounties and penalties—bounties to the rich and penalties upon the poor, forbidding the purchase of corn in one market in order to dispose of it in another. It crowded out the middlemen. The only result was one which ever follows the intermeddling of law with the natural course of trade—stagnation and decay.

More than one hundred years ago, contemporaneous with our own struggle for independence, these internal restrictions were effaced from English law. The protective system failed and free trade was established, but only within the circuit of the country's borders. In our Union we copied something from this example. Bounties were simply the price which the people paid for the lush growth of unremunerative labor. What the operatives of England paid for so many years to agriculture and its "splendid paupers," agriculture in this country has paid to the lords of the loom and the forge, who have been inspired with the same grasping avarice in their demand for enormous duties on manufactured articles.

It is not necessary, in drawing these lessons from English legislation, that I should discuss the justice of giving a bounty to one person or one class for encouragement and not to another. Absolute justice requires a bounty or a subsidy to every one, and when that paradisaical epoch arrives there is a bounty to no one! If my neighbor pay a bounty to me equal to that which I pay to him, there is no benefit to any one, except to the tax-gatherer.

PROHIBITION OF CORN IN ENGLAND.

A hundred years ago the manufacturing and commercial interests of England began to arise with greater strength. New avenues of wealth opened from the colonies. The nation received an impulse of prosperity. The consumption of corn increased and prices rose correspondingly. Then began the prohibition of grain importation.

The agricultural monopolists fancied that they were floating serenely upon the bosom of a Pactelus whose very sands were gold. They were deceived just as the protectionists in this age and country deceive themselves. Corn laws began to appear in all the variety of their manipulations to outwit the natural laws of trade. Food became dear, but dear food did not bring high wages. Riots became common. Labor was ground down between the upper and nether mill-stone of protection. Then began a most terrific era in England. It had all the agonies of a tragedy. Gaunt famine, like a skeleton, invaded laborers and tenants, even upon the very farms whence came the rich livings of the titled landlords. Wages declined, rents advanced, and wealth became more and more inequitably distributed. The rich grew richer and the poor poorer. Then came on the struggle which gave presage of relief. The landed interests were still dominant. The hungry population resented their exactions with a fury born of despair and death. Parliament was menaced. Cordons of the military surrounded St. Stephen's.

CORN-LAW REPEALERS.

During this night of British gloom the protectionists of England were callous to every appeal and every interest of human life. Starvation has a wild logic of its own. Brave men arose. They questioned with stern and pitiless inquisition the legislation which taxed bread. The scales fell from their long-abused sight. Little legislative makeshifts were used to palliate the consummate evil and postpone the dreaded crisis. In vain the great families, led by the Duke of Wellington, who threw his sword into the scale, attempted to withstand the current.

LEADERS OF THE PEOPLE AGAINST TORIES, ARISTOCRATS, AND PROTECTIONISTS.

Who led this warfare for the poor against the rich? Who gave it oratory, and dialects, and song? Who voiced the disasters and cried aloud for the reform, for the repeal of these cruel laws? Chief among those who vindicated the rights of the poor against monopoly in this legislative war, in which he never rested for years was Mr. Villiers, of Wolverhampton. He is an old, old man now. They have erected a monument to his memory, even in his life. I place his name before that of others, not less brave but more laggard, under whose leadership the repeal was consummated.

When that distinguished statesman, Sir Robert Peel, was denounced by his party in the Commons for the act of repeal he cried out defiantly:

I shall leave a name execrated by every monopolist who, from less honorable motives, clamors for protection because it conduces to his own individual benefit; but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good-will in the abodes of those whose lot it is to labor, and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow, when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened by the sense of injustice.

There were other men who championed the demand of the people for the "cheap loaf," and whose names are handed down honorably among the poor of England, whose "untaxed food was all the sweeter because it was no longer leavened by the sense of injustice."

OTHER CHAMPIONS IN AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

In the long roll of these worthies, champions too of anti-slavery in America as well as England, are Cobbett, Prentice, W. J. Fox, Hume, Potter, Dr. Bowring, Garrison, Phillips, and others. But why make the catalogue? That night of English wrong was set thick with stars—a whole constellation. Cobden among them was shining resplendently as a star of the first magnitude. [Cheers.] Cobden was not a nobleman. He was not an hereditary legislator. He was born of the people. He was the son of a yeoman. He was brought up to trade. It was his business training, together with observation abroad, while a partner in a Manchester cotton-mill, that made him so cogent in debate and so simple and earnest in his devotion to the cause of the people and to the "cheap loaf." [Applause.]

EULOGY OF COBDEN, FRIEND OF AMERICA.

I should be derelict as a member of the Congress, or as a citizen of the United States, if I did not, even in this feeble way, vindicate the splendid fame of Richard Cobden. He was not merely a friend of the poor when they needed friends, but he was a distinguished economist when economy was thundered from the hustings for the relief of the starving. More than all these, by his speeches, writings, diplomacy, and parliamentary efforts, he has done more than any other Englishman to hold up the institutions of our own country, not merely for the indulgence of mankind, but for their imitation and admiration. Nor were the encomiums which he bestowed upon our country born of a mercenary or trading spirit. He had a genuine love for America. He twice visited us. He denounced those who had depreciated our character and slandered our people.

In a volume of his writings, which I have in my hand, there is a comparison between Great Britain and America. With what fervor

he turns to the industrial, economical, and foreign peaceful policies of America, while with the live coal of a seer he bids at distance our future, Hail! He does this with a pride which knows no selfishness and with a humanity that regards no isolation. England and America were, in his view, bound together in peaceful fetters with the strongest of all ligatures that can bind two nations—commercial interests and the destiny of representative governments. [Applause.] He took pride in our discharge of our public debt. Though he found in America a rival with his own country and analyzed the disadvantages of the position of England in comparison with America, he saw in the unlimited extent of our unsettled territory a means of employing capital and labor with which the little isles of Great Britain would in vain strive to compete.

He was not insensible to the fact that the Englishman was a born aristocrat, with an insatiable love of caste, which he said pervaded every degree from the highest to the lowest; but he believed that in the course of time such changes would come through education and suffrage as to bring England upon the roster of genuine republican states. Every reform which England has made in the interests of her people, for her colonial advancement, found Richard Cobden its friend and his gifted speech its ally. And it comes with an ill grace from an American, whether native or adopted, to blur the escutcheon of this champion of America and this honest friend of the people.

I had the honor of being on the committee which welcomed him to America. He visited this Hall. He was received with as much if not more welcome from the Republican than from the Democratic side of the Chamber. No one made his name a reproach, for he had been the friend of our Union. He had been the companion of John Bright, the Quaker manufacturer of Birmingham, in denouncing with resonant eloquence and virile logic the infamies of protection.

I must beg my Irish friends to remember that Daniel O'Connell spoke for the repeal as the friend of the English and Irish people. Speaking at Manchester, he demanded to know "why, if the corn laws are good to rescue a people from wretchedness, they do not rescue the people of Ireland? If these protective laws give employment and high wages," said he, "why do they not give them in agricultural Ireland?" Subsequently, in demanding to know what the corn laws were for, he answered his own question by saying, "to put money into the pockets of the landlords—not the money of the Russians, the Danes, or the Swedes, but that of their fellow-countrymen."

POETRY OF THE REPEALERS.

Seconding these efforts of the tribunes of the people came the blacksmith poet, Ebenezer Elliott, and the "Voices from the Crowd," by Charles Mackay. These corn-law rhymes not only denounced the exactions by which bread was made dear to the people, but they looked forward to that influx of grain from the new hemisphere—America—by which the loaf would be cheapened and the people saved from starvation.

These men sung as if they disdained any compromise. They moved on to victory; they found the realm of England in discredited and hunger-ridden anarchy. The time was "ripe, and rotten-ripe," for change.

They gave it comparative quiet and prosperity, and progress followed the victory. More than that, so far as America was concerned it gave us lessons by which we were mutually bound and by which our values were immensely enhanced. The Democracy of the United States reciprocated. Robert J. Walker shook hands with Cobden across the deep. In the interest of the people of both nations a great benefaction fell like manna in a wilderness of selfishness. [Applause.] The event justifies the truth that nature, in her overflowing goodness, had provision against scarcity and famine; so that when crops fail in a small area like Great Britain, or are insufficient to supply her needs, there is lavish abundance and a surplus in other lands, in the valley of the Mississippi and its tributary streams. The law to which Virgil referred two thousand years ago as the "eternal federation" by which Rome grew great, is the same law in modern days. Progress has given to the phrase a miraculous meaning, for it multiplied the loaf for the multitude. The result here was not merely a home market for home product, but the widest extent of surface for production in our own land, causing less danger of scarcity and an abundance of the necessities and conveniences of life for exportation abroad.

The repeal of the corn laws and the tariff of 1846 was the consecrated protest of benevolent legislation. They vindicated the providence of the All-loving Father, whereby the excess of one land and its opulent harvests, and the diversified labor of the people of all countries compensate for the deficiencies of another.

The same arguments which are used to-day by the protectionists here were used by the protectionists in England to prevent the repeal of the corn laws. The old story of the home market, and especially in the contingency of foreign war and the dependence upon another country for supplies was used in the Parliament of

England just as now in the Congress of the United States. They were used in vain. England could no more be independent of foreign supply for her bread than America could be independent of England in the sale of her grain and cotton.

The fruitfulness of labor was increased, toil itself was mitigated, misfortunes were avoided, and the benefits of the repeal, through international dependence and reciprocity, gave a new impulse to both countries. It opened a market for English goods here, while it enlarged our market for our product abroad. It did not injure either country. It aided both beyond all the dreams of avarice.

During the twenty years preceding 1849 the exports of British and Irish productions had increased $33\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for each decade. From 1849 to 1859 the increase was 105 per cent. It is fair to presume that by 1859 English industry had become adjusted to the new conditions. Nevertheless, for the period up to the Franco-Prussian war there was an increase of exports of 45 per cent. The value of the exports per capita in 1849 was \$10.93; in 1859 it had more than doubled, being \$22.11. In 1869 it had risen to \$29.79. In 1878, while we Americans were making great boasts of our exports, their value per capita was only \$12. Nor have the working people of England been routed out of the mills by foreign pauper labor. In cotton manufacture the number of hands employed increased from 330,924 in 1850 to 479,512 in 1874. The woolen trade for the same period nearly doubled its force. So also the flax industry.

Among manufactures of more recent growth jute reported 5,967 operatives in 1861, and 37,920 in 1874. And the tale might be continued indefinitely.

INTERDEPENDENCY OF NATIONS.

God never made an independent man nor allowed an independent nation. Men and nations must lean upon each other. The very variety of the growth of nations with the staple of every soil make it the duty of legislators to exclude monopoly from the family of nations as selfishness from the family of individuals.

BENEFICENCE OF THE TARIFF OF 1846.

There never was a tariff during whose continuance there was so much advancement in all that makes up the wealth of nations as our low tariff of 1846. Under its provisions farmers got better prices for wheat, grain, wool, etc., than they have averaged under the present tariff. Manufactures multiplied more rapidly, farm values increased much faster, and all of our people had full employment. During that period, from 1850 to 1860-'61, a tramp was as unknown

as a "trust," a strike had no place in our political lexicon, the word "lockout" was infrequent, and the word "boycott" was not known. There were no conflicts between capital and labor. The country became harmonious so far as its policy was concerned, because it was just.

A SCOTCHMAN'S HOROSCOPE.

In glancing at the cold statement in McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary, under the head of "New York," I find from that frigid Scotchman and statist this summing up of the effect of the great commercial reform during the administration of Sir Robert Peel:

He says that the last and greatest of all changes was the change in the corn laws. It had a powerful influence in the United States. Mr. Polk's Government having free trade by these and other circumstances succeeded in carrying a comparatively liberal tariff, to take effect from first of December, 1846; and this tariff kept its ground until 1857, when it was superseded by a still more liberal one. But the downfall of the tariff by which it was carried was quickly followed by a reimposition of high duties by the act of Congress of March 2, 1861, and this again by the outbreak of the civil war.

But—

adds the great Scotchman—

the bulk of the American people have never been supposed to be blind or indifferent to their own necessities; and these they may be assured will be best promoted by reverting to, as soon as possible, and maintaining a system which enables them to sell in the dearest and to buy in the cheapest markets. If they retain high duties, they will fall wholly on themselves and on no one else, and the less they buy from foreigners the less they will be able to export to them.

In other words, as I have often preached in this House, we cannot continue to sell our surplus, which is growing every day by reason of our increasing army of labor, unless we buy from others. A one-sided arrangement leads to impoverishment, overproduction for home needs, and consequent mortgages and bankruptcy.

Mark the words which I cite from this cold statistician. He warns us that to retain high duties they will fall wholly upon ourselves, and on no one else.

Or, since gentlemen prefer figures of poetry to figures of arithmetic, I might well apply the metaphor of Byron about the struck eagle stretched upon the plain, who viewed his own feather on the fatal dart, and winged against the shaft that quivered in his heart. [Applause.]

Indeed, sir, we are already feeling the pangs of the wound that we ourselves have made; but it is all the keener to feel them when

we reflect that we have furnished the pinion which impelled the steel, and that the very plumage which had warmed our eagle's nest drank the last life-drop of his bleeding breast.

RECIPROCAL PROSPERITY.

England grew rich and America prospered by reciprocity. And when this reciprocity was broken on our part by inordinate tariffs, we failed proportionately, and the history of our tariff, shown in this debate, illustrates the fact that our tariffs, when they are low, give advantages and advancement. When they are high it is otherwise.

Patriotism and economy are not convertible terms. Economy means the law of the house, the law of supply and demand. It means cash and credit, not a banner nor a border.

Every people must trade abroad. Every individual is dependent upon some other. If he be a luxurious man, he must have jewels from Golconda polished in Amsterdam. His delicate neckerchief must tie him to the loom of Jacquard. The spices to stimulate his appetite come from the ancient seats of Oriental power. His cigar is from Cuba and Manila; his coffee from Arabia, Java, and Brazil. China gives him tea, and Cuba sugar. He will have his clothes, in spite of laws, out of the broadcloth of France and England, and his wife her dresses, of silk and satin, from Lyons, provided always they are offered on better terms, while for the man who is not a *bon vivant* or a rich man, the sail and steam of traffic is in perpetual unrest to relieve his burdens, cheapen his comforts, and provide his necessities.

Therefore liberal policies as to trade, while in our country always contemplating a revenue for an economic administration of the Government, should enlarge the area of trade and stimulate labor unto richer harvests.

No man with a particle of reasoning in his composition can say that abundance is a curse or scarcity a blessing.

The elements of England which overcame the willful obstinacy of Anglo-Saxon legislators brought mankind together and gave to the producer of corn in America his splendid market and its quick returns by steam and telegraph, and to the daily toilers of England it answered our Lord's prayer for their "daily bread."

Great Britain was forced to abandon her extreme protective policy only when the country was brought to the verge of bankruptcy, starvation, and revolution. Her protectionists, as early as 1842, made the same arguments as those made in this House by the protectionists. They predicted that the reduction of the British

tariff would shake the social relations of the country to their very foundations, subvert the whole system of society, lower wages, throw great quantities of land out of cultivation, render it impossible for the government to raise taxes, and reduce the laborer to a lower scale in life. Nothing of the kind happened.

THE ENGLISH FLAG ON THE SEA.

Among other predictions were those of Disraeli and other Tories that the ship-building of Great Britain would vanish, but never in all history has there been seen such a stupendous result as that which followed the repeal of restrictions on her ships. Her shipping rose from 3,400,000 tons in 1848 to over 8,000,000 tons in 1883, and it is still rising, while we have lost all of our foreign shipping.

OUR OCEAN TONNAGE LOST.

It is the saddest of our experiences as a nation that our flag under navigation laws that will not let us buy, and our tariff laws that will not let us build, has ceased to kiss the breezes of other than our inland and coasting States.

Dies iræ, dies illa,
Solvat sæclum in favilla.

The degradation of our commerce was like the obscuration of a star in the sky. It is not a partial but a total eclipse, a lost Pleiad without even the phantasy of a nebulous cloud to reassure us of the return of our days of commercial pride on the sea.

A PICTURE OF PROSPERITY.

Whereas, in 1841, when Sir Robert Peel took office, there was no interest, manufacturing or otherwise, which was not depressed, no property which was not depreciated, no seaport in which ships were not rotting at the wharf, no agricultural labor that was not working on starvation wages and parochial relief, and when the revenue was insufficient to meet the national expenses and bankruptcy menaced the country, all at once, as by some enchanter's wand, agriculture became prosperous, rents were increased, manufactures and employment were extended, wages were raised, the revenue was enhanced, property was improved, and taxation was lessened. Every successive movement in the amelioration of the tariff of Great Britain up to the repealing act of 1846 showed advancement in all the elements which make up the happiness and wealth of nations. [Applause.]

THE FARMING INTERESTS.

It is easily shown that not more than 5 per cent. of the labor of the country is affected by our present tariff in the way of protection.

Other members have shown the relation which the agriculturist bears to the tariff, and they have shown he is not protected at all. But, on the other hand, he is at the mercy of other countries, with their cheap forms of labor. He must sell his crops at prices fixed by the pauper labor, not only of Europe, but of Asia and Africa, since the price of wheat in this country is regulated by the price of the European markets. The whole world contributes its supplies to those markets, and the peasants of Russia, Hungary, and India, with their cheaper labor, are rivals of our farmers. Therefore, our farmers are in direct competition with the cheapest labor in the world.

The Indian fellah, with his 6 pence a day for his labor, and the Russian serf, with something less, compete with our own farmer, whose product is subject in addition to a charge for transportation through inland to seaboard and three thousand miles of water beside to the markets which fix the prices of his stuffs. When you consider that, in addition to all this, he has to pay the increased price for every protected article which he buys, you can well understand what the protective system does for him. It throttles him. It paralyzes the four million of farmers who should be the mainstay of the country. It is no exaggeration, perhaps, when one of our humorists in Georgia wags his funny tongue about the infant industry which gets its slice of bounty, and which "takes it a powerful long time to get grown."

When a man—
says he—

goes to one of these manufacturing cities he finds everybody strutting around, and the banks full of money, and the land worth \$200 a front foot; but just let Congress talk about reducing the tariff, and they scrouge up and pull a small bottle from under their coat-tails and cry out, "I am an infant—a poor little infant! Ain't you gwine to protect me? Are you gwine to take away my pap and leave me an orfen?"

Another one of our humorists in writing of and from the great West intimates that the farmer has got the priceless boon of liberty. But it is liberty to pay war prices for everything he wants, and to sell his crops for less and less year after year; liberty to pay big prices for machinery, help, clothing, and everything else he buys, and then to ride into town on a December day, accompanied by the cold remains of an assassinated hog, and then to be told that pork had gone down to 4 cents! He regarded such a ride, in the society of a hog that died by one's own hand, as depressing, and every time you look around, to see that same frozen smile with a chip in it, while his chest is thrown open in an ingenious way by

means of a hickory stick, in order to show that his leaf-lard is all that has been represented. And yet it was that same animal that had been loved so well in infancy, hid down in the cellar so you could not hear him squeal when he was killed, and which the protected farmer afterwards helped to scrape with a case-knife, so that even in death he would be a source of pride. He is depressed by the thought that all of that hog is swallowed up by the price of the protected frock he hoped to carry home to his wife.

I am not particularly alarmed at the India competition in wheat with which we are threatened. Our Department of Agriculture in its Report No. 46, November, 1887, has a paper which is calculated to allay any alarm on this subject, even in spite of the increased importation. Nor do I care to detail at the present time the varying prices of our wheat and other grain stuffs, or the ample surplus under every circumstance and condition for exportation. Our prices have been remunerative and the quantities enormous. If necessary, I will append to my remarks some tabular statements showing the distribution in latter years of the immense productions of our soil, and some extracts showing the overrated competition which we have feared from India and other countries.

A table which I have before me will show that from 1872 to 1886 the United States has furnished in grain and flour 51.10 per cent. more than one half of the whole of the wheat surplus of the world, which is absorbed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

The largest national product since 1874 is annually harvested in our country. France stands in the second rank, and imports more than she exports. India comes third, and Russia occupies the fourth rank. The table will show the various relative proportions.

My chief object in referring to these matters now is to show the impulse which was given to the accrued product of our soil by the repeal of the corn laws and the enactment of the tariff of 1846.

EXPORTS OF CORN AND COTTON BEFORE AND AFTER RECIPROCITY.

In a table which I have prepared I have taken the exports of wheat and corn alone, which includes flour and meal. I have tabulated them in five-year periods.

In 1830, at the end of the five years, we exported over 23,000,000 bushels of wheat and more than 6,500,000 bushels of corn.

These exports grew in half-decennial periods, until in 1845, preceding the great reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and the United States, when the wheat export was over 34,000,000 and the corn about 8,000,000.

Now mark the marvelous increase which, in spite of the Tories of England and their allies here, resulted from the liberalities of Cobden and his allies of the Corn Law League.

The five years ending in 1850 show our wheat export to be over 71,500,000 bushels, and our corn nearly 54,000,000. So that almost at once, compared with the five years ending in 1845, we more than doubled our wheat exportation and had more than six times as much of corn exportation. Since 1850 the figures are still more marvelous. So that at the end of the five years ending in 1885 our exported wheat amounted to 608,000,000 bushels and our corn to nearly 279,000,000 of bushels. And since that time this stupendous energy of our soil and enterprise of our farmers can be traced directly to the liberalities of interchange championed by the Cobdens of England. Is it for this great benefaction to the teeming West, with its fat glebe and stalwart farmers, that these men of 1846 are reproached by their Tory allies in America?

It is also as true with respect to the production and export of cotton as with respect to the exportation of grain. A grand impulse was given to that staple by the reciprocal laws of 1846.

Going back to 1830, when our annual production was only 1,000,000 bales and our exportation 772,000, we find that after 1848-'49 we have 2,808,000 production and 2,226,000 exportation, while during the last year our production was 6,500,000 bales and our exportation 4,500,000.

Here is to be found the wealth of our magnificent soil, whose surplus has enabled us not only to pay off our great indebtedness, but under hampered conditions and in spite of the restrictions of our tariffs, most unnaturally exacting and cruel, to assume among the powers of the earth the station which we to-day occupy.

It would seem that there is no argument that can be made from our authentic statistics cogent enough to persuade the selfishness of men even into the indulgence of self-love. Self-love has been defined as that which would lead a man to eat his own dinner and allow his neighbor to eat his, while selfishness is defined to be the appetite of a man for his own dinner and a desire to eat that of his neighbor.

It would be a very difficult task to persuade men who are selfish to indulge in self-love, much less in disinterestedness. Perhaps the most cogent reasoning on this subject would be after the manner of our humorists, known as the *ad absurdum*, which Aristotle ranks among the best rudiments of logic.

We have a humorist known as "Bill Nye." I was about to read for your relief his description, exaggerated somewhat, of the farmer's life out West. I forbear.

A MEMBER. Give it to us.

Mr. COX. I will print it, as good reading on a dry topic. This clever writer has been acting as a rural gentleman. He has ideas of stock-growing, garden-sauce, and other home-spun matters about farming in the West. I quote:

"Well, farmin' is like runnin' a paper in regards to some things. Every feller in the world will take and turn in and tell you how to do it, even if he don't know a blame thing about it. There ain't a man in the United States to-day that don't secretly think he could run airy one if his other business busted on him, whether he knows the difference between a new milch cow and a horse hay-rake or not. We had one of these embroidered night-shirt farmers come from town better'n three years ago. Been a toilet-soap man and done well, and so he came out and bought a farm that had nothing to it but a fancy house and barn, a lot of medder in the front yard, and a southern aspect. The farm was no good. You couldn't raise a disturbance on it. Well, what does he do? Goes and gits a passle of slim-tailed yeller cows from New Jersey, and aims to handle cream and diversified farming. Last year the cuss sent a load of cream over and tried to sell it at the new crematory while the funeral and hollercost was goin' on. I may be a sort of a chump myself, but I read my paper and don't get left like that.

"What are the prospects for farmers in your State?"

"Well, they are pore. Never was so pore, in fact, sence I've been there. Folks wonder why boys leaves the farm. My boys left so as to get protected, they said, and so they went into a clothing store, one of 'em, and one went into hardware, and one is talkin' protection in the Legislature this winter. They said that farmin' was gittin' to be like fishin' and huntin', well enough for a man that has means and leisure, but they couldn't make a livin' at it, they said. Another boy is in a drug store, and the man that hires him says he is a royal feller."

"Kind of a castor royal feller," I said, with a shriek of laughter.

He waited until I had laughed all I wanted to, and then he said:

"I've always hollered for high tariff in order to hyst the public debt, but now that we've got the national debt coopered, I wish they'd take a little hack at mine. I've put in fifty years farmin'. I never drank lickier in any form. I've worked from ten to eighteen hours a day; been economical in cloze and never went to a show more'n a dozen times in my life; raised a family and learned upwards of two hundred calves to drink out of a tin pail without blowing all their rattles up my sleeve. My wife worked alongside o' me sewin' new seats on the boys' pants, skimmin' milk, and even helpin' me load hay.

"For forty years we toiled along together and hardly got time to look into each other's faces or dared to stop and get acquainted with each other. Then her health ailed. Ketched cold in the spring-house, prob'ly skimmin' milk and washin' pans and scaldin' pails and spenkin' butter. Anyhow, she took in a long breath one day while the doctor and me was watchin' her, and she says to me, 'Henry,' says she, 'I've got a chance to rest,' and she put one

tired, wore-out hand on top of the other tired, wore-out hand, and I knew she'd gone where they don't work all day and do chores all night.

"I took time to kiss her then. I'd been too busy for a good while previous to that, and then I called in the boys. After the funeral it was too much for them to stay around and eat the kind of cookin' we had to put up with, and nobody spoke up around the house as we used to. The boys quit whistlin' around the barn and talked kind of low by themselves about goin' to town and gettin' a job.

"They're all gone now, and the snow is four feet deep on mother's grave up there in the old berryin' ground."

Then both of us looked out of the car window quite a long time without saying anything.

"I don't blame the boys for going into something else, long's other things pays better; but I say—and I say what I know—that the man who holds the prosperity of this country in his hands, the man that actually makes money for other people to spend, the man that eats three good, simple, square meals a day and goes to bed at nine o'clock, so that future generations with good blood and cool brains can go from his farm to the Senate and Congress and the White House—he is the man that gets left at last to run his farm, with nobody to help him but a hired man and a high protective tariff.

"The farms in our State are mortgaged for over \$700,000,000. Ten of our Western States—I see by the papers—have got about three billion and a half mortgages on their farms, and that don't count the chattel mortgages filed with town clerks on farm machinery, stock, wagons, and even crops, by gosh! that ain't two inches high under the snow. That's what the prospects is for farms now. The government is rich, but the men that made it, the men that fought perarie fires and perarie wolves and Injuns and potato-bugs and blizzards, and has paid the war debt and pensions and everything else, and hollered for the Union and Republican party and high tariff and anything else that they was told to, is left high and dry this cold winter with a mortgage of \$7,500,000,000 on the farms they have earned and saved a thonsand times over."

Yes; but look at the glory of sending from the farm the future President, the future Senator, and the future member of Congress.

That looks well on paper, but what does it really amount to? Soon as a farmer boy gits in a place like that he forgets the soil that produced him and holds his head as high as a hollyhock. He bellers for protection to everybody but the farmer, and while he sails round in a highty-tighty room with a fire in it night and day, his father on the farm has to kindle his own fire in the morning with elm slivers and has to wear his son's lawn-tennis suit next to him or freeze to death, and he has to milk in an old gray shawl that has held that member of Congress when he was a baby, by gorry! and the old lady has to sojourn through the winter in the flannels that Silas wore at the riggatter before he went to Congress.

So I say, and I think that Congress agrees with me, Damn a farmer, anyhow!

Suppose we should strike out all after the enacting clause of this bill and pass an amendment to tax all the farmer produces. Would it not compel our manufacturer to pay the foreign price of it, and the tariff of 40 or 50 per cent. besides? Perhaps this would benefit the farmer. But how would it operate as to the manufacturer and the rest of the people? And where is the difference between such a tariff and the present one, except this, that the farmer's ox is now gored, and in the other case it would be the ox of the manufacturer?

CORN-LAW REPEAL POETRY.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Butterworth], who joined his eloquent voice in the denunciation of the Cobdenites and the Democracy, must have observed how Tory protection was impoverishing and decimating the Canadian Dominion for the lack of reciprocity. He must have observed the need of just such poetry for the North as the gentleman from Michigan quoted so exultantly in the conclusion of his speech for the South.

By way of reciprocity, also, I would give the gentleman from Ohio a little gem which he can quote with reference to the protection anent the fish question, which he saw illustrated in Canada, and which is but a faint copy of what we have in this country.

One of our own native singers, known as the "Sweet Singer of Michigan," has given us a touching ode about the alligator. I commend it to the gentleman from Ohio, who has been studying the fish question in Canada:

How cheerfully he seems to grin,
How neatly spreads his claws,
And welcomes little fishes in
With gently smiling jaws!

[Laughter.]

COBDEN AND HIS CLUB SYMPATHIZERS WITH OUR UNION.

It must not be forgotten that the men who founded the Cobden Club were the men who through the darkest hours of our own civil conflict, in and out of Parliament, were devoted to our Union. It was this school of Manchester that prevented the English cabinet from joining with the French Emperor in recognizing the Southern Confederacy and breaking the blockade. What ingrates, therefore, are these Republican lovers of the Union who join the Tories to attack the Cobden Club. These promoters of interchanges, by which both countries are benefited and neither injured, or who, in the language of General Garfield in this House, desired a point of stable equilibrium upon our tariff, with a rate not so high as to keep foreign producers

altogether out of our markets or to stimulate the unnatural growth of manufactures, but who, protective step by step, reach forward to the goal of free trade—these are the men who are the object of these tirades, in order to prejudice the ignorant against the liberal tariff reformers of our country.

Why should you Republican gentlemen be so indignant that members upon this side are members of the Cobden Club? If Cobden and the club favor a tariff for revenue, without the burdens which belong to a protective system, it only shows how sensible Cobden and the club are. Have not some of your best men favored such ideas? Has it not been proven in this debate that such Republican leaders as President Garfield, Mr. Blaine, and others who were their lieutenants and subordinates were marching in the same direction? It matters not whether they belonged to an English club or not. It matters more what their sentiments were upon this theme. It proves nothing; but it is an *ad hominem*, and an estoppel upon their bravado. I challenge the other side to deny what I assert to be the truth, that the Forty-second Congress, which elected Mr. Blaine its Speaker, was organized on a liberal and not upon a protective basis. It ill becomes those who sustained Garfield and Blaine to call us to an account for the same ideas to which those Republican leaders gave their adhesion.

I now assert that Blaine virtually made a bargain with the revenue reformers shortly before his second election to the Speakership. It was to the effect that if they would not interfere with him in that election he would give them a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Forty-second Congress. [Applause.]

This compact was made—

Writes a gentleman who knows the fact—

and entered into at the Fifth Avenue Hotel during one of our revenue-reform meetings. Mr. Blaine—

He says—

was not at the meeting, but he was at the hotel, and he came there because the meeting was to be held there, as he told me at the time. He said, further, that he came expressly to see us. We were all good Republicans then. It was in our power to make "Jordan a hard road to travel" for any candidate for Speaker against whom we should unite. We had not thought of uniting against Mr. Blaine, but we had thought of taking steps to give revenue reform a push in the House, and naturally the Speakership was the place to begin. Mr. Blaine knew that the meeting was to be held, and he came or "happened in" just at the right time, but, as I have said, did not come to the meeting.

He sent for me and asked us what we wanted. I told him that we wanted

some tariff-reform legislation, and to that end we wanted a Committee on Way and Means that could be depended upon. He said that he had always treated us fairly—

[Laughter]—

and that he would do so still, but he could not give us the chairman. He did not say in so many words that he would give us a majority of the committee, but since the only way to get any reform legislation was by having a majority, we understood that "treating us fairly" meant that precise thing, but that the other side would have the chairman. Otherwise we should have carried out our original intention of selecting a Western candidate for Speaker, and supporting him with all the votes and influence we could command.

When Congress met Mr. Blaine was chosen without opposition. A few days later, and long before the committees were appointed, EUGENE HALE introduced his bills to repeal the duty on salt and coal. The latter was, I believe, turned over to General Farnsworth, HALE agreeing to support it. The debate and the vote you remember very well, because you took a lively hand in it. Both bills passed by two-thirds majority, as I recollect.

This was at the short (first) session of the Forty-second Congress, beginning March 4, 1871. At the beginning of the second session the committees were announced, and, sure enough, Mr. Blaine had given us a majority, five of our men to four of the other side. Mr. Burchard, of Illinois, was put on, at my suggestion, as a Republican revenue-reformer who could be relied upon. Mr. Finkelnburg, of Missouri, was put on at Mr. GROSVENOR's suggestion.

When the protectionists began to complain that they had been betrayed, Mr. Blaine's answer was, that he was the organ of the House and not of his own private views, whatever they might be; that the House had voted by very large majorities for the repeal of duties on coal and salt, and that he considered that an instruction to him to make the Committee of Ways and Means in harmony with those votes. This was really unanswerable, but if Mr. KELLEY and his following in the House had known what had gone before, what had taken place at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, they would not have been so easily appeased.

[Laughter.]

We, who knew about the Fifth Avenue Hotel conference, always believed that Mr. Blaine put Mr. HALE forward to introduce the salt and coal bills in order that he might afterwards say to Mr. KELLEY and the high-tariff, that the House had instructed him, etc. It is certain that Blaine helped all he could to get the bills passed. General John F. Farnsworth can testify fully on that point.

That distinguished statesman and soldier I saw here a moment ago.

A MEMBER. He is here.

Mr. Cox. I am happy to have his presence to set at rest this matter. I doubt not he will confirm my statement and that of the

other gentleman, my correspondent. [General Farnsworth bows acquiescence.] [Applause.] The gentleman bows his assent. The committee as constituted at that time had a liberal chairman, whose speeches indicate his tendency. But outside of the chairman, Mr. DAWES, of Massachusetts, there were three Democrats, Brooks, Kerr, and BECK, and two Republicans—Burchard and Finkelnburg, which gave a majority in favor of the reduction of the tariff according to the policy laid down by such advanced thinkers as Garfield, ALLISON, Logan, and others.

Now, with what sort of grace and with what abundant arrogance these gentlemen, who are now arraying themselves with the relict feathers of the "Plumed Knight," sent from Paris and Florence, and saluting him as the great vindicator of protection against the heresies of President Cleveland—can these gentlemen from Maine and other States thrust any foreign club, even when it comes in the form of an Irish shillelah, under our eyes? [Laughter.] Let them deny the statement I make and I will produce the proof. The proof will show that their trusted leaders, if not all members of the Cobden Club, were as nearly associated in principle with it as any gentlemen who have been so truculently arraigned by the Tory protectionists of this House. [Applause.]

CORN-LAW INVOCATIONS FOR THE DAWN.

I listened with rapturous delight to the murmurous river of breath which flowed so sweetly from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Burrows]. I am sorry I do not see him here.

A Member. Here he is.

Mr. Cox. I am happy to see his roseate face. He made a gallant plea for American industry, capital, and labor against the whole world. That is the title of his pamphlet. It is a superb premise of a grand speech. His quiet style, his polished periods and musical tone enraptured his side of the House, but it did not listen to his speech as I did. It has not read it since, as I have, between the lines.

It convinced me of the futilities of placing shackles upon freedom. It confirmed my belief that a home market, when good at home, would be still better when extended. It was intended to show, although he did not seem to say so, that the bill which has been introduced by the Committee of Ways and Means was but a little thing, and, as he hinted, miscellaneously begotten in the dark. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Michigan never intended, as I judge by his conclusion—and I hope the House will bear with me until I reach it

—to give forth the impression that we should be restricted in our markets, and that abundance was not a benefaction, and the deprivation of food and shelter and clothing not a curse. Oh, no! But in the conclusion of his speech truth crept in on his natural oratory, and lo! like Silas Wegg, he dropped into poetry. [Laughter.] As a devoted friend of freedom he could not conclude his eloquent speech without something ostensibly in favor of freedom. [Laughter.] What an invocation it was when he quoted the poetry of Charles Mackay! I applaud him for it; so did the Republican side applaud him, without knowing the covert and exquisite satire of his performance.

The gentleman saw in the limited relief of this bill "untoward circumstances to retard the South in her material progress;" he rallied the South, and bid her "march forth unimpeded to a splendid industrial future." Rising to a splendid climax he sounded the advance for the South. He rejoiced in the "New South, a new industrial South, born of the throes of war, but full of hope and full of courage." Indeed, it was the consummated flower of oratory. He saw the South standing "with uplifted brow facing the dawn of a mighty future; her loins girt for a new race. With unfettered hands," and, ah! here came out the grand peroration of his splendid speech, "with unfettered hand she smites the earth! The fountains of unmeasured wealth gush forth! Beneath her feet she feels the stir of a marvelous life. Her pathway is already illumed with the light of blazing furnaces. Her heavens are aglow with the break of a new day! All hail its oncoming!"

And then, with one grand, magnificent bound he leaps upon his Bellerophon and rides the winged steed of his imperial fancy.

Aid the dawning, tongue and pen;

Aid it, hopes of honest men;

Aid it, paper; aid it type;

Aid it, for the hour is ripe,

And our earnest must not slacken into play.

Then he calls on the "men of thought," the "men of action" on every side to "clear the way." What way? The way which the muse of Mackay pointed out; the very way which Cobden had blazed out. "Clear the way," so that "when the sun shall reach the zenith of that glorious day" of British free trade, "the North and the South, cemented in the indissoluble bonds of commercial and fraternal unity," will march together for "grandeur industrial triumphs."

What a splendid burst of free-trade eloquence is this! Like the

palm of Zealand, when it puts forth its flower, its sheaf bursts with a report that echoes through the forest like thunder! Even so, through the lumber regions of Michigan let this dawn of Cobden free trade light up the bosky recesses and give cheer to the lumberman as he toils through wintry privations. Not satisfied with his own glowing sentences, he summons the poet of the Cobden Club, the friend of Cobden, the companion of Ebenezer Elliott, the co-worker with John Bright, the co-laborer with Sir Robert Peel, who sang the song of the cheap loaf, free trade, and a regenerated Great Britain!

I never dreamed till I heard my friend give forth his trumpet-sound for British free trade how ennobling was the cause! You will say that perhaps he only adopted the words without meaning. But I will not believe it of so intelligent and cultivated and liberal a member as the accomplished gentleman.

It reminded me of a story. May I relieve the discussion by its relation? It is about a Baptist boy down in Virginia who desired to join the Baptist Church and be immersed. Perhaps the Baptist clergymen who fill yonder gallery may recall the circumstance. [Laughter.] The boy was named Jim. He is called to give in his experience before the deacons. They desire to know how he got religion. He told them: "I dreamed that I saw Jacob's ladder and Jacob a-wrestling with the angels, and I heard a voice saying, 'Jim, climb dat ladder;' and I clumb [laughter] and I clumb; then another voice from de clouds came down, saying, 'Jim, climb on;' and I clomb and I clomb till I got to the last round of de ladder. Den I hear a voice of de angels and of the crystal gates, saying, 'Climb on!' and I say, 'Good Lord, I can't climb no mo'.' Den the voice ring out and say, 'Jump, Jim; jump!' an' I jump, an' dis chile got the damdest fall since de fall of Adam." [Long-continued laughter.]

Was this invocation to free trade limited to my distinguished friend from Michigan? By no means. Other gentlemen hearing him arose and also cried out to aid the dawn!—the same old dawn! But we gentlemen on this side of the House are content simply with a reform which relieves us of 7 per cent. out of the 47 burden, and for purposes of business to prevent the accumulations in the Treasury of the moneys of the people.

Now I propose to signalize this conversion of my friend from Michigan and his brethren who have echoed this song of the dawn of British free trade. I do not propose to be harsh toward them. I would like to see him not only assist but be assisted in clearing out the way. He will have his troubles by the way. The dawn may be

clouded and the paper and type too heavily laden with tax to be useful in a clearing.

It would be a glorious consummation of this debate could we only have gentlemen on the other side join in this invocation to paper and to type and to the hearts of honest men to clear the way for British-Cobden free trade. And what part in this clearance would be taken by the gentleman who represents the little State of Nevada, with its 41 per cent. of foreign-born people and its 45,000 inhabitants? Will he join in the hymn when my friend from Michigan lines it out? And what will our other brethren of the Republican party do when Brother Brumm raises his "Ebenezer." [Laughter.] I would like to line out the inspiring verse. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen need not rise to sing. If the tariff were not so high I would have purchased a tuning-fork for the occasion. "Aid the dawning!" Sing! But, gentlemen, you do not sing. [Laughter.] Surely such an ecstasy as that produced by Mackay's verse, so well recited by the gentleman, must have stirred your hearts to music. [Laughter.] Or perhaps we had better have a prayer meeting. [Laughter.]

It would be indecorous on my part to say that gentlemen on the other side who have been quoting the poetry of free trade with such wild enthusiasm were ignorant of the source from which this inspiration came. I fear I am responsible for this gushing lyric, for I used it in our caucus to break the dead-lock so as to aid the dawning of our reform. [Laughter.] My friend from Kansas [Mr. Perkins] somehow got into our caucus. I think it was not intentional, for I have seen no signs of repentance and conversion. [Laughter.] He may have carried the burden of Mackay's song to the accomplished gentleman from Michigan, and hence the dawn.

I recall another verse of this poet of the people in which he plead so earnestly that the operative of England should have leave to earn his daily bread by his skill and to buy it where he would.

What do we want? Our daily bread;
And trade untrammelled as the wind;
And from our ranks shall spirits start,
To aid the progress of mankind.

It was for the dawning of that day that he sung the song so eloquently quoted by the gentleman from Michigan. It was not a British song. It was the song of a lover of his kind. When this distinguished poet came to America he again appealed for that same human liberty which had been secured in England. I commend his verse to my friends on the other side:

To the West, to the West, to the land of the free,
 Where mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea,
 Where a man is a man if he is willing to toil,
 And the humblest may gather the fruits of the soil.

THE LIBERTY OF LABOR.

Why should not these men who are the anti-slavery propagandists and prophets have favored the principles of Cobden in the interest of liberty? Does not slavery, like the restriction of exchanges, prohibit the producer from using the products of his own labor according to his own pleasure and advantage? Does it not, like slavery, deprive the individual of at least a portion of the results of his labor without return? There was no warrant in England, there is no warrant here, either by natural laws, or state laws, or constitutional requirement to restrict such freedom of exchange for the personal or class interests of any one, any more than there is a warrant for a state religion or the abridgment of speech, press, and suffrage. [Applause.]

Why should the United States with its elements of prosperity and power and its institutions of equality and freedom isolate itself as if it were Japan or Corea? Nay, why should it, when these Oriental countries are opening their ports to the world, be laggard in the race of commercial advancement? The history of mankind during all the ages displays no such fatuity.

LOW TARIFFS OF HISTORY.

Why, in Athens two thousand years ago a 10 per cent. revenue duty was regarded as an outrage. Five per cent. was the highest. In ancient Rome from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 per cent. was the highest maximum. In Turkey—may I refer to my friend again? [laughter]—8 per cent. is the tax on all foreign importations.

Our First Congress made some showing of protective duties, but the average was only $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the duties we have now on cottons, woolens, and iron that now run above 50 per cent. were then only 5.

Why, we have had forty changes in the tariff since our first enactment. It has always been protective until 1846, when it was liberalized; so that by 1860 it reached an average as low as 17 per cent. Then the war came on, which was exceptional. We then began to tinker with the tariff over and over again, until we have our present enactment.

It is the habit of gentlemen to minimize the amount of taxation by showing how small per capita each particular tax is upon our

people. Thus they infer that since it only takes 3 cents on one thing, 5 cents on another, and 10 on another, that we ought not to complain. But many a mickle makes a muckle, and the day of small things ought not to be despised.

THE LITTLENES OF TARIFF RESTRICTIONS.

Why, when we think of it, our star itself is but a little thing in space compared with the glories of our planetary and other systems. It is hardly a grain of sand amid the stellar spaces.

Professor Langley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, concludes his volume on the New Astronomy by a story which he relates of a race of ephemeral insects who live but an hour. They die of old age just after the sun rises. Their descendants may live on till mid-day, while it is another race which sees the glory of sunset.

Imagine such a scene as sunset—

says the Professor—

when the whole nation of mites gather under the shadow of some mushroom to hear what their wisest philosopher has to say of the gloomy prospect. He tells them of the time when the mushroom itself was young, and when the sun was in another portion of the sky; then that the sun had changed its course, and that all nature was about to be resolved into a fleeting nebulous mist. What the hearers of such a philosophic mite would think of his philosophy the infinite God only knows.

But it seems to me that the philosophers of our time who undertake to limit the comforts and happiness and means of living of a few mites under one portion of the mushroom, and to that portion only, are very much in the position of the ephemera, who talk about the laws of nature, as if they could constrain them to their own selfish will. [Applause.]

THE AMERICAN QUADRICENTENNIAL.

Four hundred years ago Columbus set in the forehead of his time the jewels of Elizabeth the Catholic by the discovery of America. We are preparing for the celebration of that remarkable event. The people of the three Americas will be called together to give gratulation over this marvelous fact in the history of our star.

Four hundred years ago the red man held undisputed and barbaric sway over the vast region now embraced within our limits. Out of this wilderness has arisen from the loins of the old world a nation who rejoice and boast of their liberties.

OUR ADVANCEMENT AND HOROSCOPE.

Have we not a right to rejoice and boast? Has not our greatness expanded like the oak, bole upon bole, ring upon ring, from sea to sea, from Gulf to Lake? Our benevolence, and learning, and wealth, and splendor, and commerce have become the cynosure of all eyes, even as our country is the refuge of all peoples. We need not repair to the urns of other skies or to the policies of other lands to illumine the light of liberty in our own. We have what Rufus Choate called a youthful, exultant, and defiant freedom, enshrined and consecrated, and now happily united with one sentiment and under one Constitution.

LABOR AND LIBERTY SHACKLED.

With all this wonderful experience and accomplishment, beyond the wildest dreams of that classic genius which pictured a new Atlantis and an ideal commonwealth beyond the Hesperian star, shall these be shackled by a wrongful constraint? Shall that economy which ever walks white-handed along with its sister—liberty—fail of that guiding effulgence which makes glad the enthusiasm of our people? Why should our struggling millions aspire to a better future? Why should they lay up the treasures of their enterprises, if, indeed, the spirit of freedom be wanting? Freedom not only to work as we please, but to dispose of the product of our work as we please; freedom to spend our money where we can get the most for it, and freedom to make that money without the ignominy of enslaving statutes!

What avail the plow and sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?

EXHIBIT No. 1.—*Bastiat's famous petition.*

Petition of the manufacturers of candles, wax-lights, lamps, candlesticks, street-lamps, snuffers, extinguishers, and of the producers of oil, tallow, rosin, alcohol, and generally of everything connected with lighting.

To Messieurs the members of the Chamber of Deputies :

GENTLEMEN: You are on the right road. You reject abstract theories and have little consideration for cheapness and plenty. Your chief care is the interest of the producer. You desire to emancipate him from external competition and reserve the national market for national industry.

We are about to offer you an admirable opportunity for applying your—what shall we call it? your theory? No; nothing is more deceptive than theory. Your doctrine? your system? your principle?—but you dislike

doctrines, you abhor systems, and as for principles, you deny that there are any in social economy; we shall say, then, your practice, your practice without theory and without principle.

We are suffering from the intolerable competition of a foreign rival, placed, it would seem, in a condition so far superior to ours for the production of light, that he absolutely inundates our national market with it at a price fabulously reduced. The moment he shows himself, our trade leaves us—all consumers apply to him; and a branch of native industry, having countless ramifications, is all at once rendered completely stagnant. This rival, who is no other than the sun, wages war to the knife against us, and we suspect he has been raised up by perfidious Albion (good policy as times go); inasmuch as he displays toward that haughty island a circumspection with which he dispenses in our case.

What we pray for is, that it may please you to pass a law ordering the shutting up of all windows, sky-lights, dormer windows, outside and inside shutters, curtains, blinds, bull's eyes, in a word, of all openings, holes, chinks, clefts, and fissures, by or through which the light of the sun has been allowed to enter houses, to the prejudice of the meritorious manufactures with which we flatter ourselves we have accommodated our country, a country which, in gratitude, ought not to abandon us now to a strife so unequal.

We trust, gentlemen, that you will not regard this our request as a satire or refuse it without at least previously hearing the reasons which we have to urge in its support.

And, first, if you shut up as much as possible all access to natural light, and create a demand for artificial light, which of our French manufactures will not be encouraged by it?

If more tallow is consumed, then there must be more oxen and sheep; and, consequently, we shall behold the increase of artificial meadows, meat, wool, hides, and, above all, manure, which is the basis and foundation of all agricultural wealth.

If more oil is consumed, then we shall have an extended cultivation of the poppy, of the olive, and of colewort. These rich and exhausting plants will come at the right time to enable us to avail ourselves of the increased fertility which the rearing of additional cattle will impart to our lands.

Our heaths will be covered with resinous trees. Numerous swarms of bees will on the mountains gather perfumed treasures, now wasting their fragrance on the desert air, like the flowers from which they are derived. No branch of agriculture but will then exhibit a cheering development.

The same remark applies to navigation. Thousands of vessels will proceed to the whale-fishery; and, in a short time, we shall possess a navy capable of maintaining the honor of France, and gratifying the patriotic aspirations of your petitioners, the undersigned candlemakers and others.

But what shall we say of the manufacture of *articles de Paris*? Henceforth you will behold gildings, bronzes, crystals, in candlesticks, in lamps, in lustres, in candelabra, shining forth in spacious warerooms, compared with which those of the present day can be regarded but as mere shops.

No poor *Resinier* from his heights on the seacoast, no coal-miner from the depth of his sable gallery, but will rejoice in higher wages and increased prosperity.

Only have the goodness to reflect, gentlemen, and you will be convinced that there is, perhaps, no Frenchman, from the wealthy coal-master to the humblest vender of lucifer matches, whose lot will not be ameliorated by the success of this our petition.

We foresee your objections, gentlemen, but we know that you can oppose to us none but such as you have picked up from the effete works of the partisans of free trade. We defy you to utter a single word against us which will not instantly rebound against yourselves and your entire policy.

You will tell us that if we gain by the protection which we seek the country will lose by it, because the consumer must bear the loss.

We answer :

You have ceased to have any right to invoke the interest of the consumer; for, whenever his interest is found opposed to that of the producer you sacrifice the former. You have done so for the purpose of encouraging labor and increasing employment. For the same reason you should do so again.

You have yourselves obviated this objection. When you are told that the consumer is interested in the free importation of iron, coal, corn, textile fabrics—yes, you reply, but the producer is interested in their exclusion. Well, be it so. If the consumers are interested in the free admission of natural light, the producers of artificial light are equally interested in its prohibition.

But again, you may say that the producer and consumer are identical. If the manufacturer gain by protection he will make the agriculturist also a gainer, and if agriculture prospers it will open a vent to manufacturers. Very well; if you confer upon us the monopoly of furnishing light during the day, first of all we shall purchase quantities of tallow, coals, oils, resinous substances, wax, alcohol, besides silver, iron, bronze, crystal, to carry on our manufactures; and then we and those who furnish us with such commodities, having become rich, will consume a great deal and impart prosperity to all the other branches of our national industry.

If you urge that the light of the sun is a gratuitous gift of nature, and that to reject such gifts is to reject wealth itself under pretense of encouraging the means of acquiring it, we would caution you against giving a death-blow to your own policy. Remember that hitherto you have always repelled foreign products, because they approximate more nearly than home products to the character of gratuitous gifts. To comply with the exactions of other monopolists, you have only half a motive; and to repulse us simply because we stand on a stronger vantage ground than others would be to adopt the equation $+ \times + = -$; in other words, it would be to heap absurdity upon absurdity.

Nature and human labor co-operate in various proportions (depending on countries and climates) in the production of commodities. The part which nature executes is always gratuitous; it is the part executed by human labor which constitutes value, and is paid for.

If a Lisbon orange sells for half the price of a Paris orange, it is because

natural, and consequently gratuitous, heat does for the one what artificial, and therefore expensive, heat must do for the other.

When an orange comes to us from Portugal, we may conclude that it is furnished in part gratuitously, in part for an onerous consideration; in other words, it comes to us at half-price as compared with those of Paris.

Now, it is precisely the gratuitous half (pardon the word) which we contend should be excluded. You say, how can national labor sustain competition with foreign labor, when the former has all the work to do, and the latter only does one half—the sun supplying the remainder? But if this half, being gratuitous, determines you to exclude competition, how should the whole, being gratuitous, induce you to admit competition? If you were consistent, you would, while excluding as hurtful to native industry what is half gratuitous, exclude, *a fortiori* and with double zeal, that which is altogether gratuitous.

Once more, when products such as coal, iron, corn, or textile fabrics are sent us from abroad, and we can acquire them with less labor than if we made them ourselves, the difference is a free gift conferred upon us. The gift is more or less considerable in proportion as the difference is more or less great. It amounts to a quarter, a half, or three-quarters of the value of the product, when the foreigner only asks us for three-fourths, a half, or a quarter of the price we should otherwise pay.

It is as perfect and complete as it can be, when the donor (like the sun in furnishing us with light) asks us for nothing. The question, and we ask it formally, is this, Do you desire for our country the benefit of gratuitous consumption, or the pretended advantages of onerous production? Make your choice, but be logical; for as long as you exclude, as you do, coal, iron, corn, foreign fabrics, in proportion as their price approximates to zero, what inconsistency would it be to admit the light of the sun, the price of which is already at zero during the entire day!

EXHIBIT No. 2.—*Exports of wheat and corn (including flour and meal) from the United States in five-year periods, each ended in the years named.*

Years.	Wheat-	Corn.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
1830.....	23,385,247	6,664,342
1835.....	26,823,965	5,838,478
1840.....	22,307,501	4,560,693
1845.....	34,320,346	8,005,105
1850.....	71,608,785	53,796,953
1855.....	82,194,545	28,391,020
1860.....	117,699,913	32,763,264
1865.....	237,095,572	57,318,456
1870.....	199,082,289	53,413,372
1875.....	307,897,534	152,569,127
1880.....	546,314,817	398,212,474
1885.....	608,374,048	278,779,545

EXHIBIT No. 3.—*Production and export of cotton.*

Since 1874 the statement of production is that of the cotton movement by the National Cotton Exchange. The earlier statements, both product and export, are from Dana's "Cotton from Seed to Loom."

Years.	Production.	Exportation.
	<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>
1826-'27	957,281	853,798
1827-'28	720,593	600,000
1828-'29	857,744	749,000
1829-'30	976,845	838,194
1830-'31	1,038,847	772,177
1831-'32	987,477	891,501
1832-'33	1,070,438	867,169
1833-'34	1,205,394	1,027,569
1834-'35	1,254,328	1,023,013
1835-'36	1,360,725	1,116,044
1836-'37	1,425,575	1,167,805
1837-'38	1,804,797	1,575,348
1838-'39	1,363,403	1,072,935
1839-'40	2,181,749	1,873,408
1840-'41	1,636,353	1,311,785
1841-'42	1,688,675	1,459,957
1842-'43	2,394,203	2,005,395
1843-'44	2,108,579	1,625,965
1844-'45	2,484,662	2,079,721
1845-'46	2,170,597	1,666,443
1846-'47	1,860,479	1,240,869
1847-'48	2,424,113	1,857,889
1848-'49	2,808,596	2,226,722
1849-'50	2,171,706	1,588,814
1850-'51	2,415,257	1,987,633
1851-'52	3,090,029	2,443,103
1852-'53	3,352,882	2,526,545
1853-'54	3,035,027	2,317,583
1854-'55	2,932,339	2,243,318
1855-'56	3,645,345	2,953,771
1856-'57	3,056,519	2,251,496
1857-'58	3,238,962	2,589,732
1858-'59	3,994,481	3,020,519
1859-'60	4,823,770	3,773,256
1860-'61	3,826,086	3,126,867
1865-'66	2,228,987	1,552,457
1866-'67	2,059,271	1,552,761
1867-'68	2,498,895	1,657,015
1868-'69	2,489,089	1,448,020
1869-'70	3,154,946	2,178,917
1870-'71	4,352,317	3,166,742
1871-'72	2,974,351	1,957,314
1872-'73	2,930,598	2,679,986
1873-'74	4,170,388	2,888,172
1874-'75	3,827,845	2,714,863
1875-'76	4,632,313	3,214,632
1876-'77	4,474,069	3,130,472
1877-'78	4,773,865	3,391,795
1878-'79	4,074,155	3,462,741
1879-'80	5,761,252	3,810,153
1880-'81	6,605,750	4,549,743
1881-'82	5,456,048	3,694,706
1882-'83	6,949,755	4,626,808
1883-'84	5,713,200	3,884,233
1884-'85	5,706,165	3,969,568
1885-'86	6,575,691	4,283,723
1886-'87	6,505,087	4,449,579

HON. WILLIAM D. KELLEY,

OF PENNSYLVANIA.

(Republican Side.)

In the course of an address delivered at Corsicana, Tex., on the 21st of May last, the distinguished gentleman who now presides over the deliberations of the Committee on Ways and Means said:

We produced and exchange among ourselves and consume in the satisfaction of our wants more of the products of our own labor than the two hundred millions on the continent of Europe. We have invented and have now in successful operation more labor-saving machinery than all other people. We are turning out over six thousand millions of dollars' worth of products of manufactures every year, and producing them at lower cost of production, and at the same time paying higher wages to our workmen than any other people.

As I read this tribute to the enterprise, energy, and thrift of his countrymen, I hoped to find that the speaker had supplemented it by telling his hearers that the fostering influence of protective tariffs had in less than a quarter of a century lifted us from the national bankruptcy, to which we had been reduced by the revenue tariffs of 1846 and 1857 and had exalted us to the lofty prominence among nations he so glowingly described. He could have supported these statements by reference to the report of the census for 1880, which shows that our manufacturing establishments numbered at that time more than a quarter of a million, employed \$2,790,272,606 of capital, and paid 2,738,895 manufacturing operatives the higher rates of wages to which he referred.

In view of these magnificent triumphs, which were possibly only by reason of the defense by the ægis of protection of our industries against overwhelming foreign assaults, I will be pardoned for entering an emphatic protest against the adoption of a measure which bears his name, and which, if its purpose may be inferred from its provisions, is intended to overthrow that system and scatter to the winds the magnificent results achieved in less than a quarter of a century

under its fostering influence. The enactment of this bill would instantly paralyze the enterprise and energy of the people. Under the baleful influence of such a law the report of the census of 1890 will announce the overthrow of our manufacturing supremacy and the reduction of our commanding commercial position to that of colonial dependence. It is studiously designed to produce these dire results, and nicely adapted to its purpose. [Applause.]

A PARTISAN MEASURE.

It is confessedly a partisan measure, and was framed in the interest of a party whose leaders appear to be oblivious to the overwhelming social and economic changes wrought by the abolition of slavery. As slavery was an industrial system which permitted capital to own its laborers and was adapted exclusively to the production of great agricultural staples, its prevalence prevented such aggregations of people in mining, manufacturing, and commercial towns and cities as would result from the development of the material resources and commercial possibilities of the South. Its abolition involved as inevitable consequences two changes which would be felt on every plantation and in every household throughout the territory in which the system prevailed. Neither of these consequences could be averted; they were both as inevitable as fate. The first was the creation of an imperative demand for remunerative employment for the millions of emancipated slaves, who as freemen must be invested with the privilege of earning their bread in the sweat of their faces, and providing for the sustenance and care of their families and the maintenance of homes. Involved in this change were also millions of poor and illiterate whites whose chief dependence for precarious subsistence had been the snare or trap and the gun and rod.

The demand for employment that would produce wages and subsistence was for these landless millions, as I have said, as imperative as fate. It could be neither resisted nor evaded. Yet it could not, consistently with the infirmities of human nature, be promptly acquiesced in by those who had inherited slaves as transmissible property, and been taught to regard poor whites as dangerous neighbors.

But for the presence of military power an era of lawlessness and strife would have followed these sudden and momentous modifications of the industrial and social conditions of the people of a number of great States. Happily for all parties it became apparent to many Southern men before the army was withdrawn that these changes were not as had been believed, a desolating dispensation, but were a bounteous providence, which, as a return for the pay-

ment of living wages to those landless millions for labor performed in the diversification of the agriculture of their fertile empire and the utilization of its exhaustless supplies of minerals for manufacture, promised greater wealth, more perfect security for life and order, and higher developments of civilization than they dreamed of in the palmy days when they had counted their acres by the thousand and their slaves by the hundreds. Yet, strange to say, the gentlemen who framed this bill, and who could brook neither modification nor discussion of its provisions by their associates in the committee to which the preparation of revenue bills is confided by law, are with but two exceptions representatives of what was slave territory.

Contemplating the bill in the light of these facts one involuntarily recurs to the French maxim "That the Bourbons neither learn nor forget," for an examination of its provisions will satisfy unbiased minds that they have no adaptation to the existing industrial and financial condition of the country, but would have been nicely adapted to the era during which the exigencies of slavery demanded the maintenance of free foreign trade and the repression of mining and manufacturing throughout our broad domain.

THE BILL IS AN ANACHRONISM.

Yes, the bill is an anachronism; it has no relation to this era; it belongs to the saddest epoch in our national history, the period between 1824 and 1861. During that period slavery dominated our national councils and guided the administration of our national affairs, in hostility to national interests, and in the interest of free trade twice threatened war. It was in the interest of free trade that war was threatened in support of the doctrine of nullification, and it was in the interest of free trade that the country was involved for more than four years in a fratricidal war, the proportions of which were more gigantic than ever characterized a civil war. The entire South knows that free trade was essential to the perpetuity of slavery in the Republic, and it should also know that the logic that could defend free trade in a country endowed with the boundless diversity of the elements of manufacture and the immense supply of the forces for their conversion which we enjoy, vanished when slavery was abolished.

THE REQUIREMENTS OF KING COTTON.

This is not mere theory; it is historic fact. Allow me to prove it to you and the country. It is now nearly thirty years since Pritchard, Abbott, and Loomis, of Augusta, Ga., printed, to be sold exclusively by subscription, this volume of more than 900 pages, by

extracts from which I propose to demonstrate the accuracy of the position I have just announced. Its title is "Cotton is King, and Pro-Slavery Arguments, comprising writings by Hammond, Harper, Christy, Stringfellow, Hodge, Bledsoe, and Cartwright on these important subjects." It was edited by E. N. Elliott, LL.D., president of the Planters' College of Mississippi, who also contributed to its contents an essay on "Slavery in the light of international law." It is illustrated with fine engravings of the great and logical expounders of the philosophy which regarded the maintenance of human slavery as the supreme object of the American people and the Government of the United States. Here is that of the Editor of the volume, Dr. Elliott, to whom I have just alluded; here is that of David Christy, who gave to the volume the title "Cotton is King, or Slavery in the Light of Political Economy;" here is Albert Taylor Bledsoe, LL.D., professor of mathematics in the University of Virginia, who contributed an essay entitled "Liberty and slavery, and slavery in the light of moral and political philosophy," and here is J. H. Hammond, United States Senator from South Carolina, who gave to the anti-slavery agitators of the country the phrase "Northern mudsills," as his characterization of the laboring men and women of that section, with which to inflame the passions of the entire laboring community of the North. There are also striking portraits of other apostles of the doctrine that slavery was national and freedom sectional, but I must not spend too much time on that part of the volume. I therefore proceed to submit the following extracts from its pages, which will serve to show that this bill was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the obsolete doctrines of this volume.

Slave labor has seldom been made profitable where it has been wholly employed in grazing and grain-growing: but it becomes remunerative in proportion as the planters can devote their attention to cotton, sugar, rice, or tobacco. To render Southern slavery profitable in the highest degree, therefore, the slaves must be employed upon some one of these articles, and be sustained by a supply of food and draught animals from Northern agriculturists. * * *

The attempt of the agricultural States, thirty years since, to establish the protective policy, and promote "domestic manufactures," was a struggle to create such a division of labor as would afford a "home market" for their products, no longer in demand abroad. The first decisive action on the question by Congress was in 1824; when the distress in these States, and the measures proposed for their relief by national legislation, were discussed on the passage of the "tariff bill" of that year. The ablest men in the nation were engaged in the controversy. As provisions are the most important item on the one hand, and cotton on the other, we shall use these two terms as the

representatives of the two classes of products, belonging, respectively, to free labor and to slave labor. * * *

The opposition to the protective tariff by the South arose from two causes, the first openly avowed at the time, and the second clearly deducible from the policy it pursued; the one to secure the foreign market for its cotton, the other to obtain a bountiful supply of provisions at cheap rates. * * *

The close proximity of the provision and cotton growing districts in the United States gave its planters advantages over all other portions of the world. But they could not monopolize the markets, unless they could obtain a cheap supply of food and clothing for their negroes, and raise their cotton at such reduced prices as to undersell their rivals. * * *

A manufacturing population, with its mechanical coadjutors, in the midst of the provision growers, on a scale such as the protective policy contemplated, it was conceived, would create a permanent market for their products and enhance the price, whereas if this manufacturing could be prevented and a system of free trade adopted, the South would constitute the principal provision market of the country and the fertile lands of the North supply the cheap food demanded for its slaves. * * *

The planters were led to believe that the millions of revenue collected off the goods imported was so much deducted from the value of the cotton that paid for them, either in the diminished price they received abroad or in the increased price which they paid for the imported articles. To enhance the duties for the protection of our manufacturers, they were persuaded, would be so much of an additional tax upon themselves for the benefit of the North; and besides, to give the manufacturer such a monopoly of the home market for his fabrics would enable him to charge purchasers an excess over the true value of his stuffs to the whole amount of the duty. By the protective policy the planters expected to have the cost of both provisions and clothing increased, and their ability to monopolize the foreign markets diminished in a corresponding degree. If they could establish free trade, it would insure the American market to foreign manufacturers, secure the foreign markets for their leading staples, repress home manufactures, force a large number of the Northern men into agriculture, multiply the growth and diminish the price of provisions, feed and clothe their slaves at lower rates, produce their cotton for a third or fourth of former prices, rival all other countries in its cultivation, and monopolize the trade in the article throughout the whole of Europe.

It was in vain that the friends of protection appealed to the fact that the duties levied on foreign goods did not necessarily enhance their cost to the consumer; that the competition among home manufacturers and between them and foreigners had greatly reduced the price of nearly every article properly protected; that foreign manufacturers always had and always would advance their prices according to our dependence upon them; that domestic competition was the only safety the country had against foreign imposition; that it was necessary we should become our own manufacturers, in a fair degree, to render ourselves independent of other nations in times of war, as well as to guard against the vacillations in foreign legislation; that the South

would be vastly the gainer by having the market for its products at its own doors, to avoid the cost of their transit across the Atlantic; that, in the event of the repression or want of proper extension of our manufactures by the adoption of the free-trade system, the imports of foreign goods to meet the public wants would soon exceed the ability of the people to pay and inevitably involve the country in bankruptcy. But Southern politicians remained inflexible and refused to accept any policy except free trade, to the utter abandonment of the principle of protection. Whether they were jealous of the greater prosperity of the North and desirous to cripple its energies, or whether they were truly fearful of bankrupting the South, we shall not wait to inquire.

In a speech at the Waterborough dinner, given subsequently to the passage of the tariff of 1828, Mr. Hamilton, of South Carolina, gave expression to their resolve when he said, "We must prevent the increase of manufactories, force the surplus labor into agriculture, promote the cultivation of our unimproved Western lands until provisions are so multiplied and reduced in price that the slave can be fed so cheaply as to enable us to grow our sugar at 3 cents a pound. Then, without protective duties, we can rival Cuba in the production of that staple and drive her from our markets."

**AS A LAW IT WOULD CLOSE COAL MINES, ORE BANKS, FACTORIES, AND
ARREST THE DIVERSIFICATION OF AGRICULTURE.**

These few extracts, of which more than a hundred that are equally striking might be made, will suffice to show that this bill belongs to a past age. That as a measure proposed for future guidance it is, as has been said, an anachronism, and is illustrative of systems of ethics and economic philosophy against which history has written in blood decrees that are final and immutable. None of its provisions are in harmony with the spirit of the age: for they antagonize the aspirations of the American people and are not adapted to facilitate their efforts to supply their wants, gratify their desires, and provide for the future of their families. Its first effect, should it be enacted into law, would be to arrest the magnificent development of mineral wealth, of manufacturing power, and of the diversification of agriculture now taking place throughout the South, and to paralyze the organized industries of the North.

By putting wool on the free-list it would abolish sheep husbandry, destroy the immense capital embarked therein, and impoverish the more than a million men who own the flocks or are employed in their care, and by working this ruin it would diminish the supply of cheap and healthful animal food now furnished by wool-growers to the mining and manufacturing laborers of the country. It would also render the production of American tin-plates and cotton-ties impossible by placing those articles on the free-list with wool.

By the transfer of these and other products of coal and iron ore to the free-list, and by reducing the duties on steel rails, structural iron, and many other forms of iron and steel sufficiently to withdraw protection from them and permit foreign producers to flood our markets, it would, though it maintained existing duties on coal and iron ore, close a majority of the bituminous coal fields and ore banks which are now giving profitable employment to hundreds of thousands of laborers, not only in Northern States but in Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama, and turn them adrift without prospect of other employment elsewhere than in cotton and corn fields. But while professing to have abandoned their purpose to put coal and ore on the free-list its framers have ingeniously contrived to make the importation of both free by such measures of indirection as may enable them to attempt to saddle the Treasury Department or the judiciary with the political consequences of their deliberate tergiversations.

No, the junto will not put coal and ore squarely and frankly on the free-list. They have, however, as effectually provided for the repeal of the duties that now protect them as could have been done by naming them in that list. Let us see whether I misrepresent the effect of the scattered and disingenuous provisions of this bill, when I say that they make coal and ore free. That bituminous coal and iron ore are covered by the phrase "mineral substances in a crude state, and metals unwrought not especially enumerated and provided for" can not be gainsaid. Coal is a mineral substance and iron ore a metal in a crude state and unwrought. If this be so, lines 130 and 131 of the free-list embrace them as "mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought not specially enumerated and provided for." Are coal and iron ore provided for in this bill? If they are I will be gratified to any member of the majority of the committee who will call my attention to the clause which enumerates and provides for them. They are not specially enumerated or provided for, and consequently the repeal of the existing duties on these articles is specifically provided for in lines 2 and 3 of section 41, the last paragraph of the bill, the language of which is that "all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed." This language applies to and repeals the provisions of law which now authorize the collection of duties on those "mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought" known to commerce as bituminous coal and iron ore.

JUTE AND RAMIE CULTURE IS ADAPTED TO THE GULF STATES.

But these remarks apply to mining and manufacturing enterprises, and it is natural that representatives of States in which manufactures are almost unknown, and but few of the vast mineral deposits of which have been opened, should regard with indifference or hostility the capital, skill, and labor embarked in such enterprises. But as it is now nearly a quarter of a century since the war closed, it would not seem to be a violent presumption to assume that representative men from the cotton-growing States, the value of whose mineral deposits and water power was till recently unknown or ignored, would endeavor to enhance the value of their farms by diversifying the agricultural productions of their section. But no evidence of willingness to permit the diversification even of Southern agriculture is disclosed by the provisions of this bill. On the contrary, it selects the farming industries of the country, North and South, as special objects of destruction. As the constant production of cotton impoverished the people of the South by exhausting the fertility of its alluvial fields, so, as our farmers are learning by painful experience, is the constant production of wheat and corn in the Western States and Territories exhausting the productive power of that region.

In proof of the necessity for a wider diversification of our agriculture I may point to the fact that while the average production per acre of wheat and corn diminishes the price also falls off. This is shown by the following statement from the Agricultural Department of the number of acres under wheat and corn, the total crop of each, and the average price per bushel throughout the year for the decade including 1878 and 1887:

Years.	Corn.			Wheat.		
	Acres.	Bushels.	Price per bushel.	Acres.	Bushels.	Price per bushel.
1878.....	51,585,000	1,388,218,750	\$0.31.8	32,108,560	420,122,400	\$0.77.7
1879.....	53,085,450	1,547,901,790	.37.5+	32,545,950	448,756,630	1.10.8
1880.....	62,317,842	1,717,434,543	.39.6-	37,986,717	498,549,868	.95.1+
1881.....	64,262,025	1,194,916,000	.63.6-	37,709,020	383,280,090	1.19.3+
1882.....	65,659,546	1,617,025,100	.48.4+	27,067,194	504,185,470	.88.2
1883.....	68,301,889	1,551,066,895	.42.0	36,455,593	421,086,160	.91.0
1884.....	69,683,780	1,795,528,000	.35.7	39,475,885	512,765,000	.64.5
1885.....	73,130,150	1,936,176,000	.32.8	34,189,246	357,112,000	.77.1
1886.....	75,694,208	1,665,441,000	.36.6	36,806,184	457,218,000	.68.7
1887.....	72,392,720	1,456,161,000	.44.4	37,641,783	456,329,000	.68.1

These figures show that the increase of acreage in corn was more than 40 per cent. during the decade: the increase of the yield was

less than 5 per cent., and in wheat the increase in acreage was 17 per cent., but in crops only 8 per cent. But the fact is patent that there is no department of American industry in which greater diversification is so imperatively demanded as in agriculture. Nor, except when Whitney's cotton-gin gave the South a monopoly of cotton-culture, has there been a time when the introduction of new plants and the adoption of new sources of supply and new methods of manufacture promised such profits to our farmers as do the domestication of jute and ramie in the Gulf States, and of sugar from cane in Florida or from sorghum, beets, or corn in all parts of our country at this time. The enormous rewards which follow the cultivation of jute and ramie are but faintly intimated in the following extract from a recent open letter from my friend, Professor Waterhouse, of Florida and Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., from whom I parted in San Francisco in 1870, when he left our country to visit the jute and ramie fields of India and China.

The new tariff bill proposes the abolition of the imposts on foreign jute and ramie. There are weighty reasons which plead for the exemption of these fibers from the list of free imports.

Jute is one of the most important productions of India. The variety of its uses is almost illimitable. The range of manufactures from this textile extends from coarse matting and cotton-baling to fine imitations of linen and silk. The growing needs of mankind are steadily increasing the demand for this fiber. Jute is annually enriching India with a productive wealth of scores of millions.

Ramie is the strongest fiber in the world. Narrower than jute in the range of its applied uses, it is superior in its suitability for finer fabrics. Barely inferior to silk in beauty of luster, it surpasses its glossy rival in durability. It is woven into textures of practical utility and elegant luxury. It is wrought into cordage of extraordinary strength, laces of filmy delicacy, and plushes of exquisite beauty. The demand for this valuable fiber far exceeds the supply.

The luxuriant growth of jute and ramie in the Gulf States shows that the conditions of soil and climate are suited to their culture. Numerous experiments, continued through a succession of years, justify the assurance of Southern farmers that "these plants can be cultivated almost as easily as Indian corn." The success of repeated trials has dispelled every intelligent doubt that the soil of the South is adapted to the growth of these textiles.

A diversification of industries is essential to the highest welfare of the country. The Southern States have long been impoverished by an unwise devotion to the cultivation of a single staple. There is no truer economic maxim than that variety of employment is a productive factor of national wealth. The culture of jute and ramie meets an imperative requirement. The tillage of these plants would not only richly diversify Southern agriculture, but would employ labor at seasons when cotton needs least attention, and would bring

returns at times when the income from cotton is not available. Industries opening such copious sources of public wealth, and so happily supplying the wants of both labor and capital, are worthy of legislative encouragement.

* * * * * * * * *

Under circumstances which seemingly assure the prosperity of the new culture, is it wise for Congress to make the proposed change? The abolition of duties on rival imports would benefit only a comparatively small number of people, but the successful growth of jute and ramie in the South would add large and richly productive resources to the wealth of the nation. In their crude and manufactured forms jute and ramie are yielding India and China an annual revenue of not less than \$150,000,000; but Texas alone can raise more jute and ramie than India and China have ever yet produced. Under the patronage of wise laws, with the greater productiveness of intelligent agriculture, and with the economies of efficient machinery, the South ought at an early day to derive from the tillage of these staples as large an income as India and China now do.

These statements, coming from as careful an investigator and conservative thinker as Professor Waterhouse, convince me that the cultivation and manufacture of jute and ramie would increase the price of land throughout the Gulf States, and bring to the people thereof more than one hundred millions of dollars annually as the market value of an average crop; and that the location in their midst of factories which would soon rival those of Calcutta and Dundee would more than double this annual income. And I say without reservation to the enterprising men who are shaping the destinies of and assuring prosperity and wealth to the New South that it will need only the announcement that our fields furnish jute and ramie as well as cotton to bring Northern and foreign capital to their midst to share the enormous profits of the manufacture of the newly-domesticated fibers into thread and fabrics. Addressing this class of my fellow-citizens, I also invite attention to the fact that it is the representative voice of Texas, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia that proposes not only to repel the introduction of jute and ramie, but to render unprofitable the growth of flax, hemp, manila, and other substitutes for hemp, jute, ramie, and other fibers by huddling them together on the free-list. Some of them will probably doubt my statement; but it is an absolute truth, however incomprehensible it may seem to be.

I could understand the policy of the authors of the bill if the South still needed cheap provisions for its slaves as it did when cotton was king; but now that many of its native citizens and all the land-owning immigrants from the North and foreign countries who are taking part in the reconstruction of its fortunes are raising their

own cereals, growing the grasses which give profits to dairies, and have really converted many portions of the South into agricultural districts, this resistance to diversification of Southern crops by Southern representatives is, at least to my mind, inexplicable. Should gentlemen desire to learn more of the value of jute and ramie as crops, and of the capacity of the Gulf States to produce them profitably, and of the extent and marvelous growth of their manufacture in India and Scotland, they will find a fund of information in the special report of the Department of Agriculture of 1883 on Jute Culture and the importance of the industry, which was prepared by Professor Waterhouse with the caution as to its statements of the values and amount of products which characterizes all the productions of its author.

THE WORLD OWES THE ABUNDANT SUPPLY AND LOW PRICE OF SUGAR
TO THE PROTECTIVE POLICY.

The world is indebted to the fostering care of government for the bountiful supply of sugar which enables the humblest of our laboring classes to include it in the list of their daily necessities.

President Cleveland's free-trade message, by its assumption that the duty is always added to the cost, not only of imported commodities, but to the price of like commodities produced in this country, shows how profoundly ignorant he is of economic science. To illustrate the puerile absurdity of this assumption I invite the President's attention to the fact that though the duties imposed by our Government on sugar when reduced to ad valorem standards were never so high as they now are, the price of sugar was never so low in this country as it now is. This condition of things is not exceptional, but is consistent with the history of the production of saccharine plants and the conversion of their juices into marketable sugar.

About the time of the birth of Napoleon Bonaparte French academicians who were distinguished as chemists had demonstrated the fact that sugar could be produced from beets; but while they put this fact beyond the region of doubt they were unable to produce beet sugar in quantity, and at a cost that would make it marketable. The discovery was a noteworthy fact that was not lost sight of by the academy or the practical chemists of France, and when the allied powers sought to destroy the commerce of France by blockades, orders in council, and other devices they succeeded in putting the price of sugar in Paris up to more than 5 francs per pound. Though sugar was a necessity to France she could not purchase it at that price. Bonaparte was a disciple of Colbert, the founder of the textile and ceramic industries of modern France, and he met the allies, as the

great economist would have done, by proclaiming his determination to establish the independence of France in the matter of sugar and molasses by applying the resources of the empire to their production from other sources than cane.

Bringing to his counsels the most eminent chemists and mechanics of France, he evolved two systems of bounties by which he hoped to establish new and profitable industries throughout France, and secure a cheap supply of home-grown sugar for her people. He offered bounties, beginning with 100,000 francs, to him who should produce the greatest weight of sugar beets from a given number of acres, and descending by gradual scales to small sums to the farmer who should raise the most from a single acre, and 100,000 francs to the chemist who should extract the greatest amount of sugar-yielding juice from a given weight of beets. These stimulants with the inordinate prices demanded for cane sugar exalted the question of the production of beet-root sugar into a national enthusiasm; and little more than two years were required to add it to the commercial commodities of France. Napoleon's genius guided the organization of the industry, and gave it instant popularity among the French people by rejecting the system which prevailed in the slave regions from which cane sugar had been procured. In place of immense plantations and costly factories in which cane sugar was produced he proposed small central factories in agricultural districts in which every farmer by devoting a portion of his land to beets might share the bounties the government was bestowing, and hasten the production of such supplies of sugar as would meet the demands of France and her people.

In view of the magical success of Napoleon's plan, Germany hastened to adopt it, and to establish her system of bounties and central factories. So great and immediate was the success of this new industry that in a few years the taxes imposed on beet sugar began to refund the bounties which had called it into existence. But though France and Germany have each found in the industry a prolific source of revenue, they have both maintained a system of bounties upon the sugar produced by their people, and shipped to foreign countries from their respective ports.

In view of these facts, who can deny that protection has augmented the supply and diminished the price of sugar? Yet this bill proposes a reduction of 20 per cent. on the duties now assessed on all grades of sugar above No. 13, Dutch standard,

THE EXTENT OF OUR SUGAR-BEARING TERRITORY.

The United States have more square miles of sugar-producing territory than any four other nations, and now when millions of dollars are being applied to the development of these lands shall Congress restrict the production of sugar by reducing duties under the fostering influence of which these important and costly enterprises have been entered upon? Let us glance at the extent of our sugar territory and the manifold sources from which we may produce the commodity. To assume that we are dependent upon Louisiana alone for our supply of native sugar would be a great mistake; yet when we remember that when the war closed the plantations of Louisiana were overgrown, her sugar-houses in ruins, and the costly but neglected machinery they had housed was fit only for scrap heaps, I may cite the progress of sugar-making in Louisiana since 1867 as an illustration of the vitalizing influence of protective duties. In spite of the steady decline in the price of foreign sugar, the poverty of her people, and the demoralization of her plantations, Louisiana, encouraged by protective duties, has added materially to the world's supply of cane sugar. But our sources of supply include the beet, corn, and sorghum, the last of which may be successfully grown wherever corn will mature.

I would plead for the maintenance of the present duties on sugar were cane our only source of supply, for it is predicted by Cuban and other insular experts who are skilled in the production of cane and the manufacture of sugar therefrom, that the great North American cane-field will be found in Central and Southern Florida. In this belief, capital, skill, and enterprise are flowing into that State to utilize the reclaimed "swamp and overflowed lands," which are said to be equal to the best sugar lands of Cuba. There, too, climatic advantages are very great, and give cane from six weeks to two months more time in which to ripen than it enjoys in Louisiana. This greater duration of the season is said to add an average of 20 per cent. to the saccharine strength of the crop.

A company of Northern capitalists having planted large fields of sugar near the new town of Runnymede, in the Kissimmee Valley, are investing a million dollars in buildings, machinery, and general agricultural and manufacturing facilities. Of the possibilities of Florida as a producer of cane sugar I can speak from personal observation and extended inquiry while traversing the State; but of the reputed sugar fields of Texas I speak from report from trusted sources when I say that there is a large region of land in that State which is fitted by the character of its soil and by a longer and more

genial growing season than that of Louisiana, which may be applied to the growth of sugar without interfering with the vast area which Professor Waterhouse assures us is adapted to the production of jute and ramie. Had we no other sugar lands than those of Texas, Florida, Louisiana, and other Gulf States, I should regard it as unwise and unpatriotic to reduce the duty on sugar at a time when science has just furnished cheaper and more effective methods of extracting the juice from cane, beets, and sorghum; and the emancipation of Florida from the legal embarrassments which for nearly fifty years prevented her from making title to any portion of her land, and thus repelled settlement and improvement, has enabled her to open her fertile fields to energetic and patriotic men who will under the protection of existing duties strive to save to their country the \$100,000,000 per year which we now pay Cuban slave owners for sugar, while abolishing a source which is this year contributing about \$60,000,000 to the embarrassing Treasury surplus.

CORN SUGAR.

Let us turn from the consideration of cane sugar and glance hastily at our other sources of supply. As an element of the total supply of sugar the manufacture of glucose or corn sugar does not constitute an important element; but in view of the diminishing yield of corn per acre on lands on which it is a constant annual crop, and the decline in price, notwithstanding the diminished yield per acre, this industry is worthy of consideration by our farmers. The glucose factories in the States of New York, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas employ an invested capital of \$11,000,000, with an annual capacity for the consumption of more than 19,000,000 bushels of corn. Estimating the average crop per acre at 26 bushels, 732,000 acres are required to furnish the present annual supply; and estimating the number of men required to raise corn at 3 to 100 acres, this industry employs 21,950 farmers, and 4,575 laborers in factories, at an average rate of daily wages of \$1.50, and the value of their annual production of glucose is \$17,128,000.

It is claimed for the committee's bill that it will open foreign markets to our productions, and in connection with this preposterous claim it may not be inappropriate to say that the corn consumed in this one industry, of which little is known to the farmers of the country at large, equals more than one-third of our total annual export of corn, and is about one-half the quantity consumed by our distilleries, whose interests are protected by the existing tariff and by the monopoly created and vested in the "whisky trust" by the internal taxes on distilled spirits, both of which methods of protec-

tion the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means seem to regard as vested rights of the "trust" which no legislation may repeal or modify.

BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Let us now pass from the contemplation of a puny infant to the expanding proportions of one of the world's industrial giants that is seeking domestication in our country. The production of sugar from beets in Europe is six times as great as that of Cuba from cane, and that we can produce as much as Europe does is no longer a subject of doubt. The beet-sugar factory of Alvarado, Cal., made a success of the industry in 1879, and has pursued it with profit every year since then, and if the statements of Professor Hilgard, of the University of California, who is an accredited authority, may be accepted, there are at least 5,830 square miles of land in that State suitable for the profitable growth of sugar beets. Here, then, is a field from which the entire amount of sugar and molasses now consumed in this country may be produced. The ablest man connected with the production of sugar and the world's commerce in that commodity is probably Claus Spreckels, of San Francisco. He is a credible witness, and when recently examined by a Congressional committee on this subject he testified as to the availability of great stretches of land in Alameda and contiguous counties from which he says more saccharine matter can be obtained per acre through beet culture than has yet been done anywhere on the continent of Europe. He was brought before the committee to be examined as to his knowledge of the "sugar trust" and as to whether he was connected therewith.

But the course of the investigation led him to say to the committee that he had no doubt that if the existing duties on sugar and molasses should be retained this country would, in eight years from the time at which he spoke, produce its entire supply of both these commodities. As an acquaintance of some years' standing, Mr. Spreckels favored me with a most instructive interview at my chambers on the evening following a casual meeting with him in the room of the Committee on Ways and Means. His statements were full of instruction, and his faith in their accuracy is demonstrated by the large expenditures of money and labor he is making to carry his convictions into effect.

When Mr. Spreckels determined to establish beet farms and a sugar factory at Watsonville, Cal., he departed for Europe, taking with him his son and a draughtsman and an engineer in whose attainments and judgment he has the most implicit confidence. With

these companions he explored the sugar regions of France and Germany, and studied the machinery he found in use in all the great works, together with the methods pursued in the culture of beets, and the machinery best adapted to the new processes of extracting juice from sugar-bearing plants. Having concluded his observations he contracted for machinery of sufficient capacity to exhaust 700 tons of beets in twenty-four hours. Leaving his engineer behind him he hastened home to erect a building capable of housing one-half the machinery, by the use of which he will consume 350 tons of beets to the twenty-four hours and produce 5,000 tons of sugar during the present season. While this work in field and factory is proceeding he will construct the other half of the building to house the remainder of the machinery contracted for, which will increase the capacity of the factory to 700 tons of beets to the twenty-four hours and the production of sugar to 10,000 tons per annum. This plant he proposes to enlarge annually until its product shall reach 40,000 tons per annum. Though but a private citizen, Mr. Spreckels has adopted the Napoleonic methods of conferring a lasting blessing upon his adopted country.

He has imported 25 tons of beet seed, which, having been carefully selected, cost about 15 cents a pound, which he has distributed gratuitously among farmers in the vicinity, in accordance with the number of acres they will plant, while the question of success is open to doubt in their minds. He has made contracts at satisfactory prices with one hundred and sixty-three farmers for all the beets they will produce, and to stimulate their efforts has offered two systems of premiums which, though not imperial as were those of Bonaparte, are sufficient to induce the beet-growers who have contracts with him to exercise good husbandry. To the one who having planted but 5 acres and produces best results of his class he will give a premium of \$150; to the producer of the best results from 10 acres the premium will be \$250; and for the best results from more than 10 acres it will be \$500. Twelve per cent. is agreed upon by the contracting parties as a fair standard of average saccharine strength. To those farmers whose beets yield more than 12 per cent. and not more than 13 per cent. he adds a half dollar per ton to the price of the entire crop; and to those whose beets yield more than 13 per cent. an additional half-dollar, making an increase of \$1 a ton upon their entire crop.

Claus Spreckels knows what he is about. He believes that the way to fight the "Trust" is to locate beet fields and sugar factories in all parts of the country, and to defy the conspirators against the public weal by the immensity of the product and the saving of the

cost of transportation by bringing the producer and consumer to each other's side. Mr. Spreckels insists upon it that in the hands of properly instructed farmers and with competent machinery in the factories beets may be grown and manufactured as profitably in Ohio, Illinois, and other central States as in Germany or California.

SORGHUM SUGAR.

But cane, beets, and corn are not the only plants from which we may extract sugar profitably and in quantities adequate to supply the demands of our home market. Agricultural skill and commercial enterprise have given us many and rich varieties of the sorghum plant, the value of which, under the influence of improved cultivation, recently invented machinery, and the discovery of the distributive process of extracting its juice, have assured its position with tropical cane and the beet as a source of saccharine supply. The profitable manufacture of sorghum requires the erection of factories within a radius of 6 miles from the fields upon which the plant is grown. At these factories farmers will find a cash market for their stripped cane at prices proportioned to its saccharine strength and purity. There are among the intelligent farmers of Kansas many who, having watched with interest the Government experiments at Fort Scott, are convinced beyond all peradventure that if the existing duties on sugar be maintained Kansas alone can supply the American demand for sugar from her sorghum fields. Nor do I believe that this claim is exaggerated.

That sorghum will mature wherever corn may be grown is a fact of general notoriety, and Kansas has 30,000 square miles of what may safely be regarded as good corn land. But though the recent experiments of the Government and those made by the Kansas State board of agriculture during 1887 have exhibited results that will give her a leading position among the Northern sugar States, a number of her sister States will be neither long nor far behind her in availing themselves of the profits which follow the substitution of sorghum for corn.

Mr. Cowgill, who in behalf of the State board inspected the manufacture of sugar in Kansas during 1887, says in his report—

That the sorghum yields to the farmer more than twice as much per acre as either of the leading cereals, and as a gross product of agriculture and manufacture on our own soil more than six times as much per acre as is usually realized from either of these standard crops.

And Professor Swenson, who conducted the experiments of the Agricultural Department at Fort Scott, thus sums up his report to the Commissioner:

In reviewing the work the most important point suggested is the complete success of the experiments in demonstrating the commercial practicability of manufacturing sugar from sorghum-cane.

2. That sugar was produced uniformly throughout the entire season.

3. That this was not due to any extraordinary content of sugar in the cane, but, on the contrary, the cane was much injured by severe drought and chinch-bugs.

4. That the value of the sugar and molasses obtained this year per ton of sorghum-cane will compare favorably with the highest yields obtained in Louisiana from sugar-cane, and taking into consideration the much greater cost of the sugar-cane and that it has no equivalent to the 2 bushels of seed yielded per ton of sorghum-cane, also our much cheaper fuel, I say without hesitancy that sugar can be produced fully as cheaply in Kansas as in Louisiana.

But if sorghum offers such profits to the Northern farmers, what may not those of Southern Texas and Florida derive from this plant and its manufacture? In each of these States two crops may be grown and manufactured in a year. To peril the domestication of the sorghum industry by a modification of the duties on sugar or any other manifestation of indifference to its benefits would be a crime against the farmers of every section of the country.

An incalculable element of the value of the beet and sorghum industry to the farmer is found in the fact that both serve to regenerate fields the fertility of which has been impaired by the too constant growth of wheat or corn. The exhausted lands of Germany and France have been reinvigorated by beet culture and the manufacture of sugar. And I fail to see how Congress could inflict so fatal a stroke on the interests of farmers and the industrial classes generally as by declaring the culture of sugar an outlaw in the United States by reducing duties upon it and molasses below an assuredly protective rate.

THE SURPLUS.

But the authors of this bill and the professional advocates of free foreign trade will assume from the drift of these remarks that I resist the reduction of the surplus, and am unwilling to abolish the taxes from which it flows in annually increasing volume.

I reply to such suggestions in the language of a resolution which I submitted to the House of Representatives more than seventeen years ago, on the 12th of December, 1870, and which was adopted with but six dissenting votes. It expressed the almost unanimous sentiment of the people, which had not then been corrupted by the influence of the "whisky ring" as it has been during the intervening years.

It was as follows:

Resolved, That the true principle of revenue reform points to the abolition of the internal-revenue system, which was created as a war measure to provide for extraordinary expenses, the continuance of which involves the employment, at the cost of millions of dollars annually, of an army of assessors, collectors, supervisors, detectives, and other officers previously unknown, and requires the repeal at the earliest day consistent with the maintenance of the faith and credit of Government of all stamp and other internal taxes.

In accordance with the precepts of Colbert, and the example of his illustrious disciple, Napoleon Bonaparte, I would so legislate on the question of the surplus and the sources whence it flows as to increase the wealth, power, and dignity of the country by promoting the development of its natural resources and the diversification of its industries, and thus diminish its dependence upon foreign importations upon which duties are collected. I would derive the national revenues from customs duties so adjusted to remunerative prices for commodities as to stimulate and defend home productions, while preventing combinations, trusts, and monopolies of any kind from plundering consumers by demanding fictitious prices. In pursuance of this policy I would promote by adequate duties the growth of jute, ramie, flax, hemp, and other fibrous plants, and their manufacture into thread, cordage, and fabrics; and would maintain existing duties on sugar.

I would also impose such duties on tin-plates as would quicken the mining of tin and invite the location of such smelting works, furnaces, forges, and rolling-mills for plate and sheets in close proximity to the mines as would crown the Black Hills of Dakota with industries of which the nation would be proud, and the beneficence of which all its people would soon feel and appreciate.

But these processes of reducing the revenue, though certain, will be gradual; and, as the President has truly said, "it is a condition which confronts us—not a theory," the reduction should be effected immediately by the abolition of sources of income the receipts from which may be computed month by month if not absolutely day by day. This is not only practicable but is demanded by the true principle of revenue reform which points now, in April, 1888, as it did on the 12th of December, 1870, "to the abolition of the internal-revenue system."

The politics of this country are now dominated by the whisky trust as absolutely as they were by slavery before the war, and King Alcohol is proving that he is as hostile to national development as King Cotton ever was.

Having devoted the years of my vigorous manhood to the overthrow of the political influence of the slave oligarchy, I intend to devote my declining years to the emancipation of its political affairs, from the fatal embrace of the subjects of most fruitful source of poverty, ignorance, vice, crime, disease, insanity, and ignominious death known to the civilization of the nineteenth century, and whose subtle and insidious power is arrayed alike against the mining and manufacturing interests of the country and the diversification of its agriculture.

Let me in support of this indictment glance briefly at the wrongs of the most illustrious victim of the "whisky trust," which Congress, by provisions of its laws for the regulation and collection of taxes on distilled spirits, has invested with royal prerogatives. Kentucky is the richest in natural resources, and is in geographical position and other respects the most favored of the United States east of the Mississippi. If any one of the sisterhood of American States may with propriety be spoken of as the Empire State it is Kentucky. Considered in the light of her geographical position, and her possible means of transit and traffic with and through coterminous States, she appears rather as an empire composed of several States than as a single State.

Her territory is contiguous to seven States, the population of which numbered in 1880 more than 14,000,000, which together included 307,925 square miles, and were intersected at the close of last year by 33,555 miles of railroad over which her travel and traffic might be connected with and enjoy the benefits of our entire system of local and transcontinental lines. Her area is 41,283 square miles. Her population in 1880 numbered 1,648,690, and in 1887 there were 2,070 miles of railroad operated within her limits. Her rivers are said to exceed in number, navigable length, and supply of water-power those of any other State, and the waters of the Ohio and Mississippi bathe her northern and western borders. The extent and variety of her mineral resources have not been ascertained by even a preliminary geological reconnaissance, and the fact that her agricultural resources have not been ascertained experimentally is attested by the magnificence and density of her majestic forests. The soil and climate of Central Kentucky, which in passing I may say is the seat of a more refined and cultivated pastoral community than I have ever been introduced to elsewhere, unless it was in the southern counties of England, are specially adapted to the growth of hemp, flax, and other fibrous plants, to nutritious grasses, including the world-famed blue-grass, and to all the cereals known to American agriculture. That the soil and native growths of this region of the

State contribute in an exceptional degree to the physical development of the human race and that of domestic animals is attested by the grand and harmonious development of its men and women, as well as by the almost unchallenged superiority of its highly-bred flocks, and herds, and studs of horses, which are the pride of the State.

The coal fields of Kentucky exceed in extent and richness those of England as they came from nature. She has two, the western and eastern. The former comprises about 4,000 square miles, and lies less than 100 miles southwest of Louisville; the latter, the eastern field, comprises more than 10,000 square miles, and extends from the Ohio River to the Tennessee line. Much of the coal of this field is cannel coal, of so high a grade that taking the pronunciation of its name from the illuminating power it discloses while consuming in the grate or on the hearth, many of the people call it "candle coal;" but with this priceless treasure are also vast deposits of the finest quality of coking coal, with reference to which Mr. John R. Proctor, the capable and energetic director of the geological survey now being made by order of the State, says:

1. That the largest known area of coking coal in the United States is in Southeastern Kentucky.

2. That the coal is very thick, of uniform good quality, and as favorably situated for cheap mining as any coal.

3. That it is the nearest coking coal to the center of population of the United States.

4. That it is nearer to extensive deposits of high-grade Bessemer-steel ores than is any other coking coal.

5. That it is near to extensive deposits of cheap iron ore.

6. That there are other valuable coals in this region, including large deposits of superior cannel coal.

He also says:

Since the first publication by the survey regarding the finding of this coking coal, made in 1882, the coal has been identified and traced over a wide area, and many tests have been made proving its superior quality as a coking coal.

Her almost unequalled combination of geographical advantages, agricultural capabilities, mineral and other native material for manufacture entitle Kentucky to a leading position among the progressive States of the Union; yet it is a melancholy truth that to speak of her as a leading State, a progressive State, or even as a prosperous State, would be to indulge in bitter irony.

In the midst of almost unparalleled wealth and general physical advantages the mass of her people are steeped in poverty and illiteracy, and are strangers not only to the comforts of humble life but to the commonest and most absolute daily necessities of Northern

laborers. As appears from the Census of 1880, 29.9 per cent. of her people who were ten years of age and upward were unable to write, as the following figures show. Those of this age numbered 1,163,498, of whom 258,186 were unable to read and 348,392 were unable to write.

In Rowan County, the mineral resources of which are almost incalculable, families, in default of any legitimate employment for their time, hand down from generation to generation feuds of such deadly character that enterprising men fear to traverse the region even to examine personally the vast wealth of the territory occupied by these semi-barbarians. Indeed, intelligent people throughout the country who have not given special study to the early history of Kentucky ascribe the origin of the phrase "The dark and bloody ground" to these feuds in which so many lives are taken, the takers of which notoriously defy arrest and legal punishment, rather than to the perils that attended the early settlers of the State, when the location of each new homestead was determined by the existence of a spring from which water might be procured without too great exposure of the settler or one of his family to the murderous Indians into whose midst they were carrying civilization.

Having been honored by invitations from the Board of Trade and the Commercial Club of Louisville to attend the sittings of a commercial and industrial conference of representative business men from every part of the State, and to address the conference, I reached Louisville in the afternoon of the 4th of October, the day on which the conference assembled. In the evening, while I was yet a stranger in the city, I strolled into the hall and sat where my presence was not likely to attract the attention of persons who might chance to know me, and was an interested listener to the report of a committee of the Commercial Club to whom had been assigned the duty of interrogating well-known citizens of the several counties of the State on the prevalent opinion of the county as to the propriety of inviting immigration, the kind of immigrants that were most desired, if any were deemed desirable, together with a statement of the leading products of the country, the price at which land could be purchased, and specially whether farms were for sale, and the price per acre at which they were held.

From this report and inquiries it enabled me to institute I learned that the maxim "Kentucky for Kentuckians" had been so rigidly maintained that there were many counties of the State in which a person of foreign birth or one familiar with a foreign language could not be found; that so extreme was the poverty of a majority of the people of about one-half of the counties of the State that they were

unable to defray the expenses of maintaining county government, and were therefore known as pauper counties, whose local expenditures had to be paid from the treasury of the State. Among the summary that was read of all the replies that were received there was not one that afforded any indication of an appreciation on the part of its writer of the real import of the inquiry about immigration. Three of these replies, though each forced me to smile, were painfully suggestive of the simplicity and *naiveté* of the people of the county from which they came. One suggested that two hundred able-bodied girls might be welcomed, another that more Democrats were wanted, and the other that that county did not want any more lawyers.

Let me exclude the possible conclusion from all minds, that having partaken of the refined and generous hospitalities of Central Kentucky, and of that earnest welcome bestowed upon me by the large-framed, great-hearted, and sturdy men who came from all parts of the State to take council with each other as to how their own condition and that of their suffering fellow-citizens might be improved, I am like an ingrate, abusing their hospitality and slandering them. If I have said or shall say a word that could wound the sensibility of any Kentuckian, it has not been used with that intent, and I beg the people of this wonderfully endowed State to remember the Scriptural maxim that "faithful are the wounds of a friend."

But I am not speaking otherwise here and now than I spoke to the members of the conference and the citizens of Kentucky who thronged the opera house, and gave me many proofs, during my address, that no offense was found in anything I said; but to repel beyond doubt so unjust a suspicion let me quote a paragraph here and there from the report of my remarks as I found them in the *Courier-Journal* of the next morning.

The happiness I am enjoying in this visit is simply inexpressible, for it seems to me that it is rounding out in a season of general felicitation all that is unpleasant in the memories of the past. [Applause.]

I am especially obliged to the board of trade for inviting me here to speak, for I want to ask a question or two about Kentucky, a question which you will not cheer, but which is well meant. I shall ask in a few minutes why Kentucky is a laggard among the States, and a laggard among the

REGENERATED SOUTHERN STATES.

Yes; let me here ask you gravely, why this State, whose geology gives such food to its plants as to make it the producer of the bravest men, most beautiful maidens, and most devoted matrons, not only of our own country, but of the world; whose geological construction gives beauty and vigor and harmony of

construction and movement to all animated life; whose racers are the speediest and the most enduring, and whose grasses are unequaled in the world, so that no imported stock lingers long enough to breed a progeny in the Bluegrass State, that it does not improve upon its own type; why this State, endowed not only with such qualities as these, but whose coal and iron in joint measure exceed in value the combined coal and iron of any other State in the Union—why this State, thus endowed and given such a community of men and women as are the native people of Kentucky, whose rivers are navigable for more miles than those of any other member of our great Union, who is the first-born child, I may say the first-born daughter of the Union, if I may judge by the number of brave sons and beautiful daughters she has contributed to the population of other States—why is it that I heard stated last night with prepared deliberation that so much emigration takes place from the bluegrass, coal, and iron country of Kentucky that the immigration does not compensate for it? Why should people fly from such a paradise? It seemed to me as I listened to the talk on this subject in the convention last evening that you had realized that something was wrong, and were crying to each other, if not to the Almighty, what shall we do to be saved!]Laughter.]

* * * * *

Where all are engaged in one pursuit there must be an immense waste of time, energy, hope, and all that is valuable in life. Now, my friends, how can we diversify the employments of your people? Will a tariff do it? I say yes, but it has not done it in Kentucky. I brought a paper with me to justify the remark, which if I could not sustain by evidence would prove offensive, that Kentucky is proving to be a laggard not only in the great family of her sister States, but among the Southern States.

Now, let us look at the position of Kentucky and of Louisville. No Southern city has a more advantageous one. It is near to the North and its commerce. I stand in the city to-day that bears to the whole of yonder Southwest the relation that Chicago bears to the Northwest. And that it should with the growing diversification of the pursuits of the South grow, not perhaps as rapidly as Chicago with its inland seas to contribute to its growth, but so rapidly that its growth from decade to decade would seem marvelous to its own people. [Great applause.] This is the one great city of the State. I have not traveled much in the State, and I may be disparaging other cities. If I do I pray you correct me, gently, and believe I would not have done so but through ignorance. I believe in the whole South there is only one city to contest the palm with Louisville, and that is New Orleans, and yet Louisville is greater in all business than New Orleans, although New Orleans has a site by the sea with invitations to external commerce.

* * * * *

A surprising fact is that last year the Southern States, I may say the old cotton-growing States, produced more iron than the whole Union produced before it felt the quickening influence of the protective tariff of 1861. The statistics of iron production began to be gathered by the American Iron and

Steel Association in 1854. The Morrill tariff bill was enacted while James Buchanan was President of the United States, and bears his signature; it was a protective tariff to such an extent as that it restored the ordinary revenues of the Government which had been so exhausted that the salaries of the Government official could not be paid. But I am not speaking of that; I am speaking of the decade including 1854 and 1863, the latter year having felt the effects of the protective tariff, and having added something more than 100,000 tons to the average of the other nine years. Now, the whole Union produced in those ten years an average of 813,000 tons of pig-iron, and yet last year the South alone produced 875,000 tons, an increase of 62,000 tons over the average capacity of the whole Union in the ten years preceding the enactment of the protective tariff; yet with all this I had to say to the people of the South: "You did not produce your share; you did not produce your pro rata of the grand total, which had come to be between six and seven million tons under the inspiring influence of the protective tariff; 875,000 tons was not the quota of the South, whether measured by her area, by her population, or by her now known resources of ore and flux." So I said to them: "You have done well; now do better. You have, in common with the North, found what a protective tariff can do.

Kentucky has had that same protection. She once was a leader in the Southern States in the production of iron. She should be now; but she is not. She is the fifth of the iron-producing States of the South, and she has produced less in the last six months than she did in the six months that preceded. Now, what is the matter with Kentucky? Why is the Blue-grass State thus delinquent? You may tell me she has done something else and better, and I will be glad to hear what it was; but during the last year Alabama walked forward until she is the fourth iron-producing State in the Union—Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Alabama are the four leading iron-producing States in the Union. Alabama produced last year 283,859 tons; Tennessee, 199,106 tons; Virginia, 156,250 tons; West Virginia, the infant born of old Virginia by the Cæsarian operation, 98,618 tons; and Kentucky, with thousands of square miles more of available fuel than the British islands, and with stores of iron ore equal in quantity and quality to those of Great Britain, why has she sunk beyond little new-born West Virginia, to 54,000 tons, and on a declining average at that? There is something wrong. Now, it cannot be with the people. You might as well say a Kentucky race-horse was not good as to say a Kentucky man is not full of life and vigor. You might as well say Kentucky cattle are of no account, and that the Government made a mistake in either buying or taking all the Kentucky mules she could during the war because she believed them to be the best in the country.

* * * * *

Coming back to the sorghum question, I was gratified at hearing that sorghum was the principal production of two counties, because if you could get a capitalist to set up a sugar-house and announce to your farmers that the company owning it would pay so much per ton for sorghum, depending on its

saccharine strength, you would have a new industry; you would have your farmers engage in something new, and you would have their sorghum giving them once a year, or oftener, ready cash, a thing which I am told the mountaineers of Kentucky do not have much of. [Applause.]

I heard it said here last night that in this State, so gifted with coal and iron, half the counties were paupers, and could not defray the just county expenses. I do not say that it is true, but I do say that it was stated here; and that I have reason to believe it, because no man arose and indignantly said: "No, it is not true. What! Pauper counties here in the home of Henry Clay; here where more than a century ago John Fitch was working among metals to establish that marvelous system of locomotion which now carries our internal commerce that exceeds in bulk and value every year the entire home and foreign trade of the British islands. John Fitch chose his native State of Kentucky, rich as he knew it to be in sources of wealth and power, to develop the steam-engine in its application first to water transit, and next to land transit. What! The people of the mountain counties of Kentucky specimens of the wealth of which lie upon your table, including lead and iron ores, such as Pennsylvania cannot produce, are starving? The State by adoption of my namesake, whom I am happy to state believes we are from the same paternal stem, William Kelley, of Louisville, the inventor of the Bessemer steel process, a native of Pennsylvania, but a Kentuckian by early training, and a long life of manhood now crowned by more years than my own, a man who was famous among iron-workers of the country as the iron boiler who made all the elements of the atmosphere and of the molten iron and fire, help carry the fluid from the heat that burning coal would give it to an incandescent condition and purified it and made steel of it for six years, before Bessemer announced his discovery of the same thing. The counties of this State said to be paupers? There is something wrong in Kentucky or these stories could not be circulated about her. Why, years ago Kentucky was selling nails to Pennsylvania; the first machine for cutting and heading nails was invented and constructed in Kentucky. Yes, Lexington for many years shipped nails to Pittsburgh; but the trade has gone now; you do not do it now; you have not tried to do it. What is the secret of the failure?"

My suggestion that there was something wrong in the condition of Kentucky, and my inquiries as to what caused her to be a laggard, even among the Southern States, brought no response at the time. The occasion has, however, been followed by letters from intelligent men in many parts of the State, which have been authoritative and instructive, and have convinced me that "King Cotton," having staked his throne and prerogatives upon the arbitrament of the battle-field and been beaten, his liege supporters in Kentucky found new means of maintaining their allegiance to a despotic power, and have transferred the homage they once paid to King

Cotton to King Alcohol. Yes, correspondence and personal intercourse with intelligent gentlemen during the last four months have convinced me that our internal-revenue system has accomplished the establishment in Kentucky of a despotism whose power is as absolute and whose theories of government, so far as they relate to the duty of preventing the development of the mining and manufacturing possibilities or the diversification of the agricultural industries of Kentucky are concerned, is as effective as was that of King Cotton in the legitimate cotton States of the Old South.

From many letters received on this subject I present so much of two as expose the thralldom in which Kentucky is bound and the machinations by which the whisky trust holds the writers and their fellow sufferers in industrial subjection. One of these letters was received on the 17th of March and the other some time later, but the testimony of the writers that the people of Kentucky who desire to live in harmony with the spirit of the age, and to give their native State the position to which her resources entitle her in the New South, can hope for redemption by the action of Congress alone from the terrible thralldom in which they are held is confirmed by that of many other competent witnesses. But let the writers speak for themselves. I submit first so much of the letter of March 17 as is pertinent to the question under consideration, and will follow it with an equally pertinent extract from the other letter to which I have especially referred.

* * * * *

Do you know fully (I know you know in the general way) why the internal-revenue tax on whisky ought to be wiped out?

It is because so long as the internal-revenue law exists it bands together the wholesale dealer in whisky, the distillers and hangers-on, such as bank presidents who loan on whisky, making them a close corporation upon which the Democratic wire-pullers and managers can, whenever the Democratic party here is in danger of being beaten (and it has been so several times lately) call upon it for money in bags and in sufficient amounts to turn the scale against the Republicans.

Wipe out the internal-revenue law, and they can't find another source where money can be had in bulk, at the moment of defeat, in sufficient amounts to turn the defeat into a victory. Hoping you may be able to have the whole thing wiped out.

* * * * *

In the recent defalcation of our State treasurer—\$200,000 to \$400,000—many things go to show that this fund of the State of Kentucky has for years been at

the service of the whisky ring. It was inevitable. Without the whisky ring the Democratic party would lose its hold on the State offices, and so the whisky ring and the Democratic ring are nearly identical. Now that the explosion at our State capital has occurred no more money can be had from the Kentucky treasury. Away with the revenue system and scatter the funds that are now *en masse*, held ready to use against the Republicans in Kentucky, by a law of the United States. Disperse 'em. It kills manufactures other than whisky in Kentucky. For instance, as a matter of fact, a great bank in Louisville, not national: To it goes the owner of 100 or 10,000 barrels of Bourbon whisky—known brand of Kentucky; he does not have to go to the president nor cashier, only to the discount clerk in charge; there is his table, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, date; on each or any of these you can have so much and renew *ad libitum* practically; make out your note, attach your bonded-warehouse receipt—fiat. But a manufacturer of general merchandise would not have the slightest show for a loan, because the bank could not sell his chairs, his plant, or any implement. No bonded-warehouse receipt can cover them, but with the United States holding up things, the whisky ring is omnipotent, and the general manufacturer has to go elsewhere.

In conclusion I submit, that with the facts presented these letters show that it was by the provisions of law imposing taxes on distilled spirits that the "whisky trust" was called into existence, and enabled to accomplish the revival of the despotism which pervaded the Southern States before the war; and that the power of this "trust" and the combinations of Democratic politicians with the banking influence of Kentucky can be broken only by the repeal of the internal taxes, the perpetuation of which is the issue presented to the American people by the President in his free-trade message and by the Southern gentlemen who have dominated the counsels of the Committee on Ways and Means and submitted this bill to the House for consideration. For myself I will stand for the protective system and the maintenance of such rates of duties as will insure the development of all the resources of the country, increase the number of its industries, and perpetuate its independence, commercial and industrial as well as political. This happy consummation cannot be achieved if the internal-tax system is to be maintained, for the surplus is a condition that cannot be perpetuated with safety to our republican institutions.

The purity of the Government, the safety of business, and the morals of the people demand the abatement of the surplus by the repeal of the special war taxes from which it flows. If we shall fail to abolish these taxes, and in addition to the hoarding of millions of dollars in the Treasury of the United States, we also maintain a

system of securities by which from seventy-five to one hundred millions dollars more of our money shall be applied exclusively to the use of the "whisky trust" in its war upon our industries and national independence, history, when referring to the surplus and its demoralizing influence, will impute the crime that perpetuated it and the consequences with which it is fraught to the Fiftieth Congress. [Great applause.]

HON. JOHN G. CARLISLE, OF KENTUCKY.

(Democratic Side.)

MR. CARLISLE (the Speaker). Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to the committee for its courtesy in granting me an unlimited extension of time, but I shall endeavor to confine my remarks within the usual limits, even if compelled to omit some matters which it had been my purpose to discuss.

I shall not attempt to follow the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] in all the arguments he has made, or in all the illustrations he has submitted to the committee; for, in fact, I was unable to hear a large part of what the gentleman said.

The gentleman started out with the proposition that the supporters of the pending bill are either inconsistent or insincere, or perhaps both; because, he says, if protection is wrong, a tariff for revenue is also wrong; that there is no difference in principle between them, the difference being only in degree. Therefore the gentleman's argument is that the supporters of this bill should advocate absolute free trade. I might retort upon the gentleman by saying that if the doctrine of protection is correct, then that doctrine should be carried by its friends to its logical and legitimate results—absolute prohibition of foreign imports. [But the gentleman from Maine has made this unnecessary, because he has announced that such is his purpose, and the purpose of his political associates, if necessary, and that they will preserve in this country all of its own trade and wealth, even if compelled to erect a Chinese wall around it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Sir, China preserved all the trade and wealth of her own people within her own limits for thousands of years, but I do not think that the advocates of diversified industries or the friends of labor can find much to encourage them in the social and industrial condition of that country to-day. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] There the doctrine of protection, pure and simple, was carried to its logical results, and it produced its inevitable effects. With the oldest civiliza-

tion in the world, with every variety of soil and climate and natural resources, with a frugal and industrious people, with a literature abounding in philosophical and speculative thought, the useful arts and manufactures are still in their infancy, and labor is still the abject slave of capital. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No, sir; we do not want another China here, nor do we want or expect absolute free trade. We all recognize the fact, which I suppose even the gentleman from Maine will concede, that the Government must have a revenue for its support, and that this revenue must be raised by taxation in some form or other. I presume the gentleman from Maine will also concede that all taxation is an evil which it would be well to avoid, if possible, but that as it cannot be avoided entirely we are simply reduced to a choice between that system which would confine the trade of our own people, in a large measure at least, to our own limits without increasing the revenues of the Government, and the more liberal system which will make trade and commerce as free as possible consistently with the raising of sufficient revenue for the support of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If our manufacturing or mining industries, or any other industries in the country, receive a benefit by the imposition of duties upon imported goods under this system, they are entitled to it and they are welcome to it. [Renewed applause.] It is impossible to impose taxes under any system that can be devised without hurting somebody or helping somebody; and for my part—and I think this is the sentiment of my political associates on this floor—I would rather help them than hurt them. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine, in all his long discourse, lasting nearly two hours, made no reference whatever to the actual situation which now confronts us—a situation which makes it the imperative duty of the Representatives of the people to reduce the revenues before this Congress shall adjourn. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It appears from the last official statement that there was in the Treasury at the close of the last month, including subsidiary and minor coins, the sum of \$136,143,357.95 over and above all the current liabilities of the Government. This was \$56,676,662.65 more than the surplus on hand on the 1st day of December, 1887, and shows that there has been since that date an average monthly increase of \$11,335,332.15. The surplus accumulation each month under the existing system of taxation is more than the total cost of the Government during the first two years of Washington's administration, while the aggregate sum is considerably in excess of the whole expenditure of the Government during

the first eighteen years of its existence under the Constitution, including civil and miscellaneous expenses, war, navy, Indians, pensions, and interest on the public debt.

Every dollar of this enormous sum has been taken by law from the productive industries and commercial pursuits of the people at a time when it was sorely needed for the successful prosecution of their business, and under circumstances which afford no excuse whatever for the exaction. [Applause on Democratic side.] There is not a monarchical government in the world, however absolute its form or however arbitrary its power, that would dare to extort such a tribute from its subjects in excess of the proper requirements of the public service [renewed applause]; and the question which Congress is now compelled to determine is whether such a policy can be longer continued here in this country, where the people are supposed to govern in their own right and in their own interest.

During the progress of this debate more than one gentleman on the other side has referred to the enormous surplus now in the Treasury as a matter of but little consequence; and in fact there are some who appear to regard it as a blessing, rather than a misfortune, that we should have more than \$130,000,000 of the people's money withdrawn from the channels of trade and securely locked up in the vaults of the Government. Sir, I can imagine no financial condition more dangerous to the integrity of legislation and the prosperity of the country than that which results from the existence of a large surplus in the public Treasury. Even if it were possible for such a surplus as we now have to accumulate without the imposition of any tax or burden upon the people, it would still be, in my opinion a very great misfortune, because the inevitable effect would be to encourage useless and extravagant appropriations in violation of those principles of public economy which are absolutely essential for the preservation of a popular government with constitutional limitations upon its powers. [Applause.]

If there be any serious danger now threatening our institutions, it is the growing disposition among those who represent particular classes and special interests to disregard the checks and break down the barriers of the Constitution in a promiscuous scramble for a division of the public treasure. Fortunately there is in no part of the country any feeling of opposition to the proper exercise of public authority, either State or Federal. On the contrary, the prevailing tendency is toward the enlargement and extension of governmental power by construction, especially in matters involving the appropriation and expenditure of money.

When the Government has collected, or is collecting, more money

than it needs, the people, realizing the injustice of a policy which unnecessarily deprives them of a part of their earnings, are almost sure to demand its return in some form or other. If the Government may rightfully exercise the power of taxation for other than public purposes, it is difficult to convince those who pay the money that it cannot also rightfully exercise the power of appropriation for other than public purposes. It is safe to say, therefore, that so long as this policy shall be continued, not only will largesses and bounties for the promotion of purely private interests be demanded, but new fields for the exercise of legislative power and new objects for the appropriation of the public money will be discovered.

But it is said that we still have outstanding a large public debt, and that no great injury can result to the country if the present rates of taxation shall be continued and the surplus revenue used in the purchase of bonds. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that so long as we have a surplus its application to the extinguishment of the public debt is the very best use that can be made of it. [Applause.] But I totally dissent from the proposition that it would be wise or just to raise a surplus revenue by taxation merely for the purpose of purchasing at a premium the unmatured bonds of the Government, except so far as may be necessary to meet the requirements of the sinking-fund law; and I am not satisfied that it would not be good policy, if the revenue could be properly reduced, to suspend the operation of that law, in whole or in part, for a reasonable time. It is not possible to defend, and it would be ruinous to perpetuate, a fiscal policy which compels the people to pay to the public creditors twenty five cents on the dollar more than the obligations of the Government call for; and yet that is just what we are doing and just what we must continue to do unless the revenue is reduced by the passage of this or some other bill.

On the 17th day of last month the Secretary of the Treasury, in pursuance of authority conferred upon him by the law of March, 1881, as interpreted by the two Houses of Congress, issued a circular inviting proposals for the sale of bonds to the Government. The first purchase was made under this invitation on the 18th day of April, and between that date and the close of business yesterday, a period of one month, he has purchased on account of the Government 4 per cent. bonds to the amount of \$13,456,500, upon which interest had accrued at the date of the purchase to the amount of \$53,172.07. For these bonds he was compelled to pay the sum of \$17,046,136.06, which was \$3,536,464 more than the principal and accrued interest, or a premium of 26½ per cent. During the same time and under the same authority he purchased 4½ per cent. bonds to the

amount of \$12,404,450, upon which interest had accrued to the amount of \$108,086.55. For these bonds he paid the sum of \$13,379,188.37, which was \$866,652.37 in excess of the principal and interest. The premium paid upon this class of bonds was nearly 7 per cent.

This is the situation into which the Government has been forced by the failure of Congress in past years to make provision for a reduction of taxation. Millions of dollars which ought to have remained in the hands of the people who earned the money by their labor and by their skill in the prosecution of business have been taken away from them by law to be paid out to the bondholders in excess of their legal demands against the Government. [Applause.] And, sir, if the present Congress shall adjourn without applying a remedy, this unjust process must go on for an indefinite length of time. In the presence of such a situation we cannot afford to quarrel about trivial details. A reduction of the revenue—not by increasing taxation, as some propose, but by diminishing taxation in such a manner as will afford the largest measure of relief to the people and their industries—should be the great and controlling object to which everything else should be subordinated. [Applause.] I do not mean that every interest, however small and apparently insignificant, should not be carefully considered in a friendly spirit, but I do mean that the general interests of the many should not be subordinated to the special interests of the few. [Applause.]

Although the question now presented is purely a practical one, it necessarily involves, to some extent, a discussion of the conflicting theories of taxation which have divided the people of this country ever since the organization of the Government. There is a fundamental and irreconcilable difference of opinion between those who believe that the power of taxation should be used for public purposes only, and that the burdens of taxation should be equally distributed among all the people according to their ability to bear them, and those who believe that it is the right and duty of the Government to promote certain private enterprises and increase the profits of those engaged in them by the imposition of higher rates than are necessary to raise revenue for the proper administration of public affairs; and so long as this difference exists, or at least so long as the policy of the Government is not permanently settled and acquiesced in, these conflicting opinions will continue to embarrass the representatives of the people in their efforts either to increase or reduce taxation.

While no man in public life would venture to advocate excessive taxation merely for the purpose of raising excessive revenue, many will advocate it, or at least excuse it, when the rates are so adjusted

or the objects of taxation are so selected as to secure advantages, or supposed advantages, to some parts of the country or to some classes of industries over other parts and other classes; and this, Mr. Chairman, is the sole cause of the difficulties we are now encountering in our efforts to relieve the people and reduce the surplus. It is the sole cause of the unfortunate delay that has already occurred in the revision of our revenue laws, and if the pending bill shall be defeated and disaster in any form shall come upon the country by reason of overtaxation and an accumulation of money in the Treasury, this unjust feature in our present system will be responsible for it. [Applause.]

Whenever an attempt is made to emancipate labor from the servitude which an unequal system of taxation imposes upon it, whenever it is proposed to secure as far as possible to each individual citizen the full fruits of his own earnings, subject only to the actual necessities of the Government, and whenever a measure is presented for the removal of unnecessary restrictions from domestic industries and international commerce, so as to permit freer production and freer exchanges, the alarm is sounded and all the cohorts of monopoly are assembled to hear their heralds proclaim the immediate and irretrievable ruin of the country. [Applause.]

We have been told over and over again during this debate that the passage of the pending bill will destroy many valuable industries now flourishing in various parts of the country; that it will deprive thousands of laborers of employment and greatly reduce the wages of those who continue to work; and the gentleman from Maine, who has just spoken, has substantially repeated the gloomy predictions to which the House has listened so often during the last three weeks. Sir, if I believed that the passage of this measure would injure a single honest industry or reduce the wages of those who are employed in it, I would, notwithstanding the great emergency which confronts us, hesitate long before giving it my support. [Applause on [the Democratic side.] But in my opinion the reductions now proposed on dutiable imports, and the proposed additions to the free list, will be beneficial to the manufacturers themselves as well as to their laborers and the consumers of their products; and as the Representatives from New England on the other side of the House appear to be especially alarmed concerning the injurious effects of this bill upon the great manufacturing industries in their part of the country, it may not be inappropriate to call their attention to a few historical facts connected with our tariff legislation in the past and the effects of low rates of duty upon the prosperity of their people. The highest rate of duty imposed by the tariff act of 1846 upon any class of woolen

goods, cotton fabrics, manufactures of leather, and of hardware, was 30 per cent. ad valorem, and upon most kinds of cotton goods it was only 25 per cent. These were the industries in which New England was most largely engaged, and her Representatives here, except those from the State of Maine, who were divided upon the question, protested against the passage of that act, as they now protest against the passage of the pending bill, upon the ground that it would paralyze and ruin these great interests. The Representatives from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont voted unanimously against the bill, with the exception of Mr. Colamer, of Vermont, who did not vote at all. But it passed nevertheless, and became a law; and now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what its effect was upon the most important industries of these great manufacturing States, and what the subsequent action of their Representatives was after an experience of eleven years under these moderate rates of duty.

We have no authentic statistics showing the progress made by manufacturing industries between 1846 and 1857 as a separate and distinct period of time, but it may be fairly assumed that the full force and effect of the new rates of duty were realized at least as early as the census year 1849, and we have the census returns of 1850 and 1860, the latter based upon the productions of the year 1859, to which I beg leave to invite the attention of gentlemen from New England and other gentlemen who believe that low tariffs destroy manufactures and pauperize labor. During the period mentioned the value of all our woolen manufactures increased more than 42 per cent.; the number of hands employed increased $18\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., but the total amount of wages paid increased nearly 37 per cent. [applause], showing that the percentage of increase in the amount of wages paid was twice as great as the percentage of increase in the number of hands employed. [Applause.] Taking all the New England States together the increase in the value of the product in this industry was 62 per cent. The increase in Massachusetts was 54 per cent.; in Rhode Island, 176 per cent.; in Vermont, $61\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and in Maine, $83\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In the manufacture of hosiery the progress during the ten years under consideration was almost marvelous. In the Eastern States the increase in the value of the product was 481 per cent. It was 523 per cent in Connecticut, 377 per cent in New Hampshire, and 373 per cent in Massachusetts.

What was the effect upon the manufacture of cotton fabrics in New England and in the whole country? Why, sir, the value of the production in the United States increased 77 per cent., the number of hands employed increased $28\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the total amount of

wages paid increased 39 per cent. [Applause.] In New England the increase in the value of the product was over 81 per cent., in the number of hands employed 28 per cent., and in the amount of wages paid 36 per cent. Massachusetts increased her product 77 per cent., New Hampshire 55 per cent., Rhode Island over 87 per cent., Connecticut 116 per cent., Maine 137 per cent., and Vermont 27½ per cent.

In the six New England States the increase in the value of the product in the manufacture of boots and shoes was 83 per cent.; in Massachusetts the increase was 92 per cent., in Connecticut 10 per cent., in Maine 99 per cent., and in Rhode Island 337 per cent. The production in New England alone in 1860 was greater than the aggregate production of all the States of the Union in 1850. In the manufacture of hardware New England increased the value of her product 100 per cent., and in this industry also her product in 1860 was greater than the product of all the States in 1850.

Instead of paralyzing the industries and pauperizing labor in New England, or any other part of the country for that matter, the tariff act of 1846 infused new life and vigor into our languishing manufactures and secured more constant employment and higher wages to our laboring people; and the consequence was that even the strong prejudices of New England were removed by actual experience, and in 1857 every Representative from that part of the country who voted at all voted for a bill making an almost uniform reduction of 20 per cent. from the rates imposed by the act of 1846 and placing many additional articles upon the free-list.

Here is the vote upon the tariff act of 1857, as it first passed the House, a Republican House over which Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, presided as Speaker. Five of the six Representatives from Maine voted for it, and the other one, who was absent when the vote was taken, had made a speech in favor of its passage. Nine of the ten Representatives from Massachusetts voted in the affirmative, and the other was in the chair and did not vote. Every Representative from New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island was present and voted for the bill, and among them appears the name of the venerable and distinguished Senator who still serves his State at the other end of the Capitol, Hon. JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

The bill to which I have referred was sent to the Senate, where it was amended by making a very slight increase in the reductions on certain articles, and, finally, upon agreeing to the conference, eighteen Representatives from New England voted in the affirmative and nine in the negative. Two-thirds of the men chosen by the

people of New England to represent their interests in Congress declared by this vote that a further reduction would be beneficial to their industries, and thus the tariff act of 1857, which we have so often heard denounced on the other side of the House, became the law of the land by the votes of Republican and New England Representatives.

These Representatives of the greatest manufacturing section of the country had seen their industries grow and prosper as they had never grown and prospered before; they had seen capital realizing adequate returns upon its investment; they had seen the number of laborers employed constantly increasing and the rates of wages continually rising, and they had seen at the same time the agricultural and commercial interests of the people in all parts of the country flourishing to an extent which the wildest enthusiast had scarcely dreamed of before. All these things they had seen, Mr. Chairman; but there are other things with which we have grown perfectly familiar in these times of high-tariff and class legislation which they did not see. They did not see great monopolies and trusts created to limit the supply and control the prices of the necessities of life. [Great applause.] They did not see enormous fortunes accumulated in a few years by corporations and individuals engaged in favored industries, while the great mass of the people were struggling hard to live comfortably and pay their taxes; nor did they see at any time during that period, as we have seen, thousands of honest laborers parading the streets of our cities clamoring for work, or assembling around our mines and factories with hired police to watch them. [Applause.]

This was the experience of the Representatives from the New England States during the eleven years from 1846 to 1857, under a low tariff; and is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that they came here and by a unanimous vote demanded a still further reduction in the interest of the manufacturers? [Applause.] And if this bill shall pass and become a law, I predict that within less than eleven years from this time the gentlemen who now represent New England on this floor and oppose this bill will be here voting for a further reduction, or the people will send somebody here who will so vote. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if time would permit I would like to submit some of the opinions delivered by the leading representatives of our manufacturing interests during the debate upon the tariff act of 1857, and even at the risk of dwelling too long upon this subject I will venture to read a few short extracts from the speech of Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, afterwards Vice-President of the United States, a gentleman who perhaps understood as thoroughly as any one the real

condition and necessities and of his constituents. Among other things he said:

"The manufacturers, Mr. Chairman, make no war upon the wool-growers. They assume that the reduction of the duty on wool, or repeal of the duty altogether, will infuse vigor into that drooping interest, stimulate home production, and diminish the importation of foreign woollen manufactures, and afford a steady and increasing demand for American wool. They believe this policy will be more beneficial to the wool-growers, to the agricultural interests, than the present policy. The manufacturers of woollen fabrics, many of them men of large experience and extensive knowledge, entertain these views, and they are sustained in these opinions by the experience of the great manufacturing nations of the Old World.

"Since the reductions of duties on raw materials in England, since wool was admitted free, her woollen manufactures have so increased, so prospered, that the production of native wool has increased more than 100 per cent. Their experience of England, France, and Belgium demonstrates the wisdom of that policy which makes the raw material duty free. Let us profit by their example."

When this speech was delivered wool had been admitted free of duty in England for a period of less than thirteen years, and yet the testimony of this distinguished New England Senator was that it had already doubled the product of native wool in that country. In the same speech he said further :

"If our manufactures are to increase, to keep pace with the population and the growing wants of our people; if we are to have the control of the markets of our own country; if we are to meet with and compete with the manufacturers of England and other nations of western Europe in the markets of the world, we must have our raw materials admitted duty free or at a mere nominal rate.

* * * * *

"We of New England believe that wool, especially the cheap wools, manila, hemp, flax, raw silk, lead, tin, brass, hides, linseed, and many other articles used in our manufactories can be admitted duty free, or for a mere nominal duty, without injuring to any extent any considerable interest of the country."

Further on he said :

"In closing, Mr. Chairman, the remarks I have felt it my duty to submit to the Senate and the country, that the Commonwealth I represent on this floor—I say in part, for my colleague, Mr. Sumner, after an enforced absence of more than nine months, is here to-night to give his vote if he can raise his voice for the interest of his State—has a deep interest in the modification of the tariff of 1846 by this Congress. Her merchants, manufacturers, mechan-

ics, and business men in all departments of a varied industry want action now before the Thirty-fourth Congress passes away.

"They are for the reduction of the revenue to the actual wants of an economical administration of the Government; for the depletion of the Treasury, now full with millions of hoarded gold; for a free-list embracing articles of prime necessity we do not produce; for mere nominal duties on articles which make up a large portion of our domestic industry, and for such an adjustment of the duties on the productions of other nations that come in direct competition with the product of American capital, labor, and skill as shall impose the least burdens on that capital, labor, and skill."

In the same debate Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, said:

"On Sheffield hardware, such as cutlery, edged tools, files, and saws, some protection is needed a little longer, but for this 20 per cent is ample; and upon all other kinds 10 per cent., I feel quite sure, is fully sufficient."

The present duty on cutlery is 50 per cent., just two and a half times the amount which Mr. MORRILL said was fully sufficient more than thirty-one years ago. On files the duty now runs from 52 to 65 per cent., an average of three times the rate specified by Mr. MORRILL; and on hardware it is now three times what he thought was necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it is customary in all our debates on the tariff for gentlemen on the other side to depict in the darkest colors the condition of the country during the financial depression of 1857. That depression, from which the country recovered in a few months, was an insignificant incident in our history in comparison with the great industrial, commercial, and financial storm which began here in 1873 and devastated the country for five years [applause], closing mills and factories, extinguishing the fires in our furnaces, ruining banking and mercantile houses, and throwing hundreds of thousands of laboring people out of employment. Under a low tariff our industries soon revived and the country started again, like an awakened giant, on its march to wealth and power [applause], but under a high tariff it struggled on for five weary years, and, for the first time in its history, was brought face to face with those difficult and dangerous social problems which still confront us, and which it will require all the wisdom and patriotism of her ablest and best citizens to solve.

It has been repeatedly charged here and elsewhere that the credit of the Government was so reduced by the act of 1857 that it was compelled to sell its bonds at a discount of 12 per cent. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], speaking of the effects of the acts of 1846 and 1857, said:

“But this brief period of prosperity was quickly followed by the revenue tariff of 1846 and 1847, which brought to the country another era of industrial depression, culminating in the bankruptcy of 1857, the disastrous consequences of which are still within the memory of living men. Universal bankruptcy confronted the people, and the government, with an empty Treasury, was forced in a time of peace to borrow money at a discount of from 12 to 30 per cent.”

I hold in my hand a volume issued from the Treasury Department in 1881, while Mr. Windom was Secretary, giving the history of all the loans negotiated by the Government from the time of its organization to the date of the publication; and this account, taken from the official records, shows that from the time of the passage of the tariff act of 1846 down to the last few days of Mr. Buchanan's administration, when civil war was imminent, not a bond or Treasury note or Government obligation in any form was sold at less than par, while many of them having but a short time to run and bearing but 5 per cent. interest were sold at a very considerable premium in gold. [Applause.] After the passage of the Morrill tariff bill, in March, 1861, and after the Democratic administration had gone out and a Republican administration had come in, twenty-year bonds, bearing 6 per cent. interest, were sold at 15 per cent. discount. [Applause.] But does the gentleman think it would be fair to charge this to the high tariff of 1861? Does the gentleman think that it would be fair for me to say that these bonds were sold at a discount because the rates of duty on imported goods had been increased by the act of March 2, 1861? Sir, I would be ashamed of myself if I should make such a charge. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The truth is that the credit of the Government was always good until the breaking out of the civil war, or at least until it became evident that there was to be a great civil commotion in this country. But, Mr. Chairman, I have already devoted too much time to this part of the subject. My only excuse for it is that there has been so much misunderstanding or misrepresentation concerning the history of what the gentlemen on the other side call the “free-trade” period that it seemed necessary to make some allusion to it.

Mr. Chairman, during the last fiscal year the average rate of duty upon dutiable imports was about \$48 upon each \$100 worth of goods, and the revenue collected from that source was more than \$212,000,000. During the same time the Government collected about \$119,000,000 under the internal-revenue laws, nearly all of which came from the taxes on distilled spirits, fermented liquors, and manufactured tobacco. In the fiscal year 1866, which was the first

entire fiscal year after the close of the war, the receipts from internal-revenue taxes amounted to nearly \$311,000,000, while the receipts from customs, or tariff taxes, amounted to \$179,000,000, and the rate upon dutiable goods was \$40.19 upon each \$100 worth.

This brief statement shows that while the receipts from customs have largely increased, the receipts under the internal-revenue laws have been greatly diminished, and that the taxes imposed by those laws are now collected from a few articles of luxury, or of taste, the use of which could be almost, if not entirely, dispensed with without injury to the people. There are many who believe, in view of the large reductions heretofore made in the internal-revenue taxes, and in view of the fact that they are not now imposed upon articles of necessity, that the whole reduction now so much needed and so urgently demanded by the country should be accomplished by the revision of the tariff laws; but the framers of the pending bill, recognizing and respecting the differences of opinion which exist upon this question, have proposed to deal with both systems of taxation. They propose to make a reduction of \$78,000,000 based upon the receipts of the fiscal year 1887. About \$54,000,000 of this is proposed to be taken from the tariff taxes and about \$24,000,000 from the internal-revenue receipts by the repeal of the tax on tobacco and the abolition of certain special taxes upon dealers and others.

So far the opposition to the bill has been directed mainly against that part of it which proposes to repeal or reduce the tax upon certain classes of imported goods; and gentlemen, speaking for the interests which have long ago been relieved of all the burdens imposed upon their industries, earnestly protest that the consumers of their products shall have no relief, or at least that they shall not have the full measure of relief contemplated by this bill. In 1866 there was collected from the incomes of those having net annual receipts exceeding \$600 the sum of \$72,982,159, and from manufacturers and their products, excluding distilled spirits, fermented liquors, and tobacco, the sum of \$127,230,609. Every vestige of this enormous burden upon our manufacturing industries has been removed, and properly removed, but the high rates of duty imposed on imported goods, to compensate for this domestic taxation, have not been removed. It was a very great mistake, to say the least, that they were not both removed at the same time, for after having afforded relief to one side it seems almost impossible to secure relief for the other. There never was a time while these heavy internal taxes remained upon their products that the manufacturers would not have been glad to surrender a large part of the tariff duties in order to secure a removal of the charges upon their industries. In 1867 Mr.

SHERMAN, of Ohio, who was doubtless familiar with the views of those engaged in manufacturing industries, said in a speech in the Senate:

"Every law imposing a duty on imported goods is necessarily a restraint on trade. It imposes a burden upon the purchase and sale of imported goods and tends to prevent their importation. The expression 'a free-trade tariff' involves an absurdity."

Again he says:

"Every duty on imported merchandise gives to the domestic manufacturer an advantage equal to the duty."

[Applause.]

How will gentlemen reconcile this statement with the contention on that side that the consumer does not pay the increased price?

"Every duty on imported merchandise gives to the domestic manufacturer an advantage equal to the duty, and to that extent every tariff is a protective tariff."

[Applause.]

Again he said on the particular point I am discussing:

"If you converse with intelligent men engaged in the business of manufacturing they will tell you that they are willing to compete with England, France, Germany, and all the countries of Europe at the old rates of duty. If you reduce their products to a specie basis, and put them upon the same footing they were on before the war, the present rates of duty would be too high. It would not be necessary for scarce any branch of industry to be protected to the extent of your present tariff law. They do not ask protection against the pauper labor of Europe, but they ask protection against the creation of your own laws."

[Applause.]

He referred to the internal-revenue laws and the paper currency. All the internal-revenue laws of which the manufacturers then complained have been long since abolished. The business of the country is now, and has been for many years, conducted upon a specie basis, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the great body of consumers in this country, the men and women who toil in the unprotected industries, have a right now to demand that their claims for relief shall be considered in any measure that may be passed for the reduction of the revenue. [Applause.]

In a speech delivered in the Senate in 1872 upon this same general subject, Mr. SHERMAN repeated substantially the same views, but I will not detain the committee by reading it.

A MEMBER. I would like to hear it.

Mr. CARLISLE. It is good reading.

A MEMBER. It will help him at Chicago.

Mr. CARLISLE. If he will stand by the doctrines and policy he announced then it ought to help him to secure the Republican nomination at Chicago. He said, in a speech delivered on the 15th of March, 1872:

"It must be remembered that the present duties, taken together, are far in excess of what they were before the war, and that they have been three times largely increased since the passage of the Morrill tariff act of 1861.

"The result of such duties is to secure to mechanical industries higher wages than can be earned in other kindred employments. Such excessive protection not only ceases to diversify production, but forces labor into protected employments. If the present rates of duty were high enough during and since the war, when home industry was burdened with heavy internal taxes—with stamp duties, income taxes, and high rates on raw materials—then surely they are now too high when all these taxes are removed. * * * I have listened with patience, day by day, to the statements of gentlemen who are interested in our domestic productions. I am a firm believer in the general idea of protecting their industries, but I assure them, as I assure their representatives here, that if the present high rates of duty, unexampled in our country, and higher by nearly 50 per cent, than they were in 1861, are maintained on metallic and textile fabrics after we have repealed the very internal taxes which gave rise to them, and after we have substantially given them their raw materials free of duties, we shall have a feeling of dissatisfaction among other interests in the country that will overthrow the whole system, and do greater harm than can possibly be done by a moderate reduction of the present rates of duty. And I am quite sure that intelligent men engaged in the production of various forms of textile and metallic fabrics feel as I do, that it is wiser and better to do what is just and right, to make a reduction on their products, at least to the extent of the reduction in this bill on their raw materials, rather than to invite a controversy in which I believe they will be in the wrong."

[Applause.]

And he also said this, to which I desire to call the particular attention of my friends on the other side of the House, those who disagree with me upon the principles which ought to govern taxation in this country:

"The public mind is not yet prepared to apply the key to a genuine revenue reform. A few years of further experience will convince the whole body of our people that a system of national taxes, which rests the whole burden of taxation on consumption, and not one cent on property or income, is intrinsically unjust. While the expenses of the National Government are largely

caused by the protection of property, it is but right to require property to contribute to their payment. It will not do to say that each person consumes in proportion to his means. This is not true. Every one must see that the consumption of the rich does not bear the same relation to the consumption of the poor as the income of the one does to the wages of the other. As wealth accumulates this injustice in the fundamental basis of our system will be felt and forced upon the attention of Congress."

[Great applause.]

I do not know any place where this principle has been more clearly stated than it is here stated by the Senator from Ohio. But I must pass on to other matters.

It seems that our friends on the other side have at last concluded that there ought to be a reduction of the revenue, and many gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the pending bill have foreshadowed their policy. Its main feature, in fact about its only feature as regards the tariff, is the total repeal of the duty on sugar and the payment of a bounty to the producers of that article; not to the laborer who tills the soil and converts the cane juice into sugar, but to the capitalist who owns the plantation and the refinery. After all their professions of love for the laboring man, after all their arguments to show that labor receives the benefit of the tariff, after all their harrowing descriptions of the deplorable condition to which our laboring classes would be reduced if the tariff were removed, when they come to put their propositions in the form of practical legislation the mask falls off and the natural features of the system are exposed.

—But, sir, let us see what would be the effect of the repeal of the duty on sugar—the effect upon the revenue and upon the people who are compelled to pay taxes in some form for the support of the Government.

The latest reports I have at hand showing the total amount of sugar produced in this country and the total amount consumed are for the year 1886, and they show that the domestic production was 302,754,486 pounds, while the total consumption was 3,111,640,000 pounds. It thus appears that considerably less than one-tenth of the domestic consumption is produced at home, and that the remainder is imported and pays duty at the custom-house. The duty collected during the last fiscal year was \$57,000,000. Now, assuming that the whole amount of the duty is added to the price of the domestic article, it is clear that whenever \$1 is taken out of the pocket of the consumer on account of this increased price more than \$10 are paid into the public Treasury for the support of the Government and the discharge of its obligations.

The repeal of this duty, therefore, while it would undoubtedly reduce the revenue, would afford very little relief to the people in comparison with the relief that would be afforded by the repeal of duties upon many other articles in common use. For instance, the duty collected last year upon woolen goods, cotton goods, and iron and steel was \$62,000,000; but this was a very small proportion of the burden actually imposed upon the consumers of these articles. According to the last report of the American Iron and Steel Association, which has just been issued, there were produced in this country during the year 1887, 2,354,130 gross tons of Bessemer-steel rails. The duty upon this article is \$17 per ton. Applying the same rule to this article which I have applied to sugar, and which gentlemen on the other side also apply to sugar, that is, that the whole amount of the duty is added to the price of the domestic product, it is easy to see that the increased cost of steel rails alone to the people of this country in 1887 was over \$40,000,000, although the Government received only about \$1,000,000 revenue from this source.

The proposition to pay a bounty of 2 cents per pound out of the Treasury to the sugar-grower is a confession of all that has been charged against the present system of tariff taxation. It is a confession that the tariff tax is a bounty to the manufacturers or other producers of the domestic article of the same character as the imported article, and it is a confession that the amount of the duty on the foreign product is added to the price of the domestic one; for if these charges be not true there is no semblance of justice or propriety in the proposition to pay a bounty of 2 cents per pound as a compensation for the repeal of the duty.

Sir, I am just as much opposed to the raising of a fund by taxation for the purpose of paying a bounty to the sugar-growers of Louisiana as I would be if it were to be paid to the cotton-growers of Georgia or the wheat-growers of Minnesota. It is a vicious and demoralizing policy, and can never become permanent in this country. If gentlemen desire to extend relief to the producers of sugar, and at the same time help all the other people of the country, let them propose to reduce or repeal the taxes upon the iron and steel implements used in the cultivation of the soil; upon the machinery employed in the preparation of their crops for the market; upon the materials used in the construction of their buildings, and upon the clothing which they and their families and laborers are compelled to wear. This would be a general and not a partial measure of relief, and would be creditable to a great political party which seeks to govern the whole country. The people who are interested in the production of sugar can neither be bribed nor deceived by the

offer of a bounty, for they know that their fellow-citizens engaged in other pursuits will not consent to be taxed for any great length of time for any such purpose.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stubbornly contended all through this debate that high rates of duty upon imported goods are beneficial to the great body of consumers, because such duties, instead of increasing the price of the domestic articles of the same kind, actually reduce the prices. If this be true all the other arguments in support of the existing system are not only superfluous, but manifestly unsound. The proposition that a high tariff enables the producer to pay higher wages for his labor, and the proposition that it also reduces the prices of the articles he has to sell, which are the products of that labor, are utterly inconsistent with each other, and no ingenuity of the casuist can possibly reconcile them. [Great applause.] Labor is paid out of its own product, and unless that product can be sold for a price which will enable the employer to realize a reasonable profit and pay the established rates of wages, the business must cease or the rates of wages must be reduced. When the price of the finished product is reduced by reason of the increased efficiency of labor, or by reason of the reduced cost of the raw material, the employer may continue to pay the same or even a higher rate of wages and still make his usual profits. But the tariff neither increases the efficiency of labor nor reduces the cost of the raw material.

I do not deny that prices have greatly fallen during the last fifty years, not only in this country, but all over the civilized world—in free-trade countries as well as in protectionist countries. Nor do I deny that during the same time the general tendency has been towards an increase in the rates of wages; and this is true also of all civilized countries, free-trade and protection alike. It is not possible for me now to enumerate, much less discuss, all the causes that have contributed to these results. One of the most efficient causes, in fact the most efficient cause, is the combination of skilled labor with machinery in the production of commodities. The introduction and use of improved machinery has wrought a complete revolution in nearly all our manufacturing industries, and in many cases has enabled one man to do the work which it required one hundred men to do before. Here is a statement furnished by the United States Commissioner of Labor to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, showing the value of the product of a week's labor in spinning cotton yarn by hand and the value of the product of a week's labor combined with machinery in the same industry. In 1813, one man working sixty hours by hand could turn out 3 pounds of cotton yarn, worth \$2.25, or 75 cents per pound; now the same

man, if he were living, could turn out in sixty hours with the use of machinery 3,000 pounds of cotton yarn of the same character worth \$450 [applause], or 15 cents per pound. The cotton-spinner now receives as wages for his week's work more than three times as much as the total value of the product of a week's work, including the value of the material, in 1813; and yet labor is far cheaper to the employer now than it was then. Although the employer now receives only one-fifth as much per pound for his cotton yarn as he did in 1813. he realizes from the sale of the products of a week's labor just two hundred times as much as he did then.

I have also a statement prepared by the same official, showing the relative production and value of product of a weaver using hand and power machinery, from which it appears that a weaver by hand turned out in seventy-two hours in 1813 45 yards of cotton goods (shirtings), worth \$17.91, while a weaver now, using machinery, turns out in sixty hours 1,440 yards, worth \$108. Substantially the same exhibit could be made in regard to a very large number of our manufacturing industries.

Is it strange, Mr. Chairman, in view of these facts, that the prices of manufactured goods have fallen or that the wages of the laborers who produce them have risen? Is it not, on the contrary, remarkable that there has not been a greater fall in prices and a greater increase in wages? Undoubtedly there would have been a greater reduction in prices and a greater increase in wages if there had been a wider market for the products and a lower cost for the material.

The tremendous productive forces at work all over the world in these modern times, and the small cost of manual labor in comparison with the value of the products of these combined forces, cannot be realized from any general statement upon the subject. In order to form some idea of the magnitude of these natural and mechanical forces, and the efficiency of manual labor and skill when connected with them, let us look at the situation in six of our own manufacturing industries. In the manufacture of cotton goods, woolen goods, iron and steel, sawed lumber, paper, and in our flouring and grist mills, there were employed, according to the latest statistics, 517,299 persons, not all men, but many of them women and children. This labor was supplemented by steam and water power equal to 2,496,299 horse-power. This is equal to the power of 14,977,794 men; and thus we find that a little over 517,000 persons of all ages and sexes are performing, in connection with steam and water power, the work of 15,495,093 adult and healthy men.

The railroad, the steam-vessel, the telegraph, the improved

facilities for the conduct of financial transactions, and many other conveniences introduced into our modern systems of production and distribution and exchange have all contributed their share towards the reduction of prices, and it would be interesting to inquire what their influence has been; but I cannot pursue this particular subject further without occupying too much time.

Gentlemen are in the habit of referring to the great decline in the price of steel rails in this country as conclusive evidence of the fact that the tariff reduces the cost of manufactured products to the consumer. Why, sir, they could not, in my opinion, have selected a more unfortunate illustration. In the first place, the prices of steel rails have fallen all over the world and especially in England, where they are and always have been admitted free of duty. The price there is now and has at all times been very much lower than here. In the second place, the price was falling rapidly both here and in England before the imposition of the duty of \$28 per ton by act of Congress in 1870. During the five years next preceding the imposition of that duty the price in England had fallen steadily, year by year, and had declined from \$85.65 per ton to \$50.37 per ton; and in the United States the same process had been going on, and the price had fallen from \$148.50 per ton in gold in 1864 to \$91.17 in 1870. Then the increased duty was imposed, and what was the result? The price immediately began to rise, both here and in England, so that in 1873 the average price in England was \$80.05 per ton and the average price here was \$103.91 per ton in gold. Then came, in the fall of that year, the great industrial and financial depression which arrested the growth and development of the country, suspended the construction of works of internal improvement, paralyzed our industries, and brought down the prices of nearly everything that the people produced. Steel rails, of course, like all other manufactured products, felt the influence of this depression, and the price declined and has never since been as high as it was before.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are told that a tariff is beneficial to the farmer because, first, it protects him against competition from the agricultural products of other countries, and, secondly, because, by diversifying our industries and increasing the number of persons engaged in other than agricultural pursuits, it furnishes him with a profitable home market for his products. It cannot be necessary for me to make an argument to show that no rate of duty, however high, upon articles which the farmer is compelled to send abroad and sell at foreign prices, can possibly benefit him here at home or elsewhere. This has been so often shown, and is so

thoroughly understood by the farmers themselves, that it would be a waste of time to dwell upon the subject.

It is barely possible that at particular points along or near our Canadian border there are times when the small duty on barley, potatoes, hay, and a few other articles prevents competition from the other side of the line; but if the gentleman from Maine is correct in his contention that the tariff does not increase the price of the domestic product, of course this is of no advantage whatever to the American farmer. In fact, according to the gentleman's argument, if the tariff has any effect at all upon the interest of the farmer in the cases I have mentioned, it reduces the prices of his product, and is therefore an injury to him.

But I do not agree with the gentleman, and I concede that the producer of these articles at the places indicated may occasionally receive higher prices for them than he would receive if there were no duty; but while they receive this occasional benefit—which is a very slight one even when they enjoy it—they are all the time and under all circumstances subject to the burdens imposed by high rates of duty upon articles which they do not produce but are compelled to buy and use. When the advantages are set off against the disadvantages, the benefits against the burdens, the balance will be very largely on the wrong side. [Applause.]

Of course our home market has been constantly improving, and under any system of taxation will continue to improve to a greater or less extent with the increase of population and wealth, the extension of the use of machinery, which reduces the cost of production, and the multiplication of facilities for communication and transportation, which reduces the cost of distribution. But how long, Mr. Chairman, are our farmers to be compelled to pay tribute to other industries and wait for the creation of a home market that will take all their own products at fair prices? Among our greatest agricultural products are wheat and cotton. They constitute the main reliance of millions of our people for a profitable use of their lands, and many hundred millions of dollars are invested in the soil and buildings and machinery devoted to their production. Taking the average crop of wheat in this country for several years past, and assuming that there shall be no increase whatever in production, and that the domestic consumption per capita shall remain just at what it now is, there would still be no sufficient home market for this great agricultural staple until our population had reached nearly one hundred million.

The official statistics of the domestic production, exportation, and home consumption of raw cotton show that it would require three

times as much machinery and three times as many operatives as we now have to convert this material into commercial fabrics here at home; in other words, we are now compelled to export two-thirds of our product to be manufactured in foreign countries, while one-third only is manufactured at home by all the machinery and labor now employed. In 1880 there were \$219,505,000 invested in cotton manufactures, and there were employed in that industry 172,554 hands. To work up our present production of raw cotton would require an investment in this manufacture of \$660,000,000 and the employment of 517,662 hands. If we have been more than one hundred years, part of the time under very high tariffs, in so developing our cotton manufactures as to enable them to take one-third of our product at European prices, how many more centuries will be required to enable them to consume the whole product at prices fixed by competition here at home? [Great applause.] When gentlemen have solved this problem to the satisfaction of the American cotton-grower, he may be able to listen with patience to the arguments by which they attempt to convince him of the immense advantages of a home market that will never exist. What is to be done with these great agricultural products, and with many others which are now exported, while the farmers are waiting for the home market which the advocates of restrictive legislation have been promising them for so many years? Are the farmers and planters of the North and South to abandon their wheat and cotton lands or cultivate crops not suited to their soil or climate while gentlemen are making experiments to ascertain whether or not a home market may not be created by legislation? No, sir. No matter what gentlemen may predict or what they may promise, these great industries must go on, and the American farmer must sell his products in any market he can reach and at any price he can get. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], while appearing to admit that the prices of our exportable agricultural products are fixed in the foreign markets in which they are sold, endeavors to avoid the force of the admission by contending that the prices in the foreign market are regulated by the amount of production here. Now, Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the amount of production here has some influence upon the prices abroad, but the controlling elements are the world's supply and the world's demands. Our farmers do not compete among themselves alone in the provision markets of Europe. Our wheat-growers, for instance, compete with the wheat-growers of England, France, Germany, Russia, Hungary, India, and all the other grain-growers of Europe and Asia, and their product

meets in the open and free markets of the world the products of the poorest-paid labor on the face of the earth.

The lately emancipated serfs of Russia; the oppressed peasantry of Hungary; the ryot of India, who lives on millet and rice, wears no garment except a coarse cotton shirt, and sleeps on the floor of a bamboo hut—all pour the products of their labor into the free markets of Europe to be sold in competition with the grain from our Western States and Territories. Sir, our agricultural constituents are not ignorant of the true situation. They know very well that as to all the articles which we are capable of exporting and are actually exporting—and this includes all the principal productions of their industry—the foreign market is just as valuable to them as the home market, for the obvious reason that the prices are fixed abroad, and they receive here only what they could receive there, after deducting the cost of transportation. [Applause.]

What the American farmer most needs is a home market in which he can purchase his supplies as cheaply as his competitors purchase theirs [applause]; and if he cannot secure this, then he simply asks the poor privilege of making his purchase where he is compelled to make his sales, and to be permitted to bring his goods home without being compelled to pay unreasonable taxes and fines by his Government for carrying on a harmless and legitimate business. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we want not only the home market, but all the markets of the world for the varied products of this great country. [Applause.] We want to send our agricultural products, our cotton, and our breadstuffs and our provisions, to the naked and hungry manufacturing peoples of Europe, and our manufactured products to the agricultural peoples of South America, Mexico, and Asia. We can do this when we determine to trade with other people upon fair terms, but we cannot do it so long as we protect England and other manufacturing countries in the great markets of the world upon the pretense of protecting ourselves in our own. Let us diminish the cost of production in our agricultural and manufacturing industries, not by diminishing the wages of labor, but by reducing taxation upon the necessaries of life and upon the materials which constitute the basis of our finished products, and by removing, as far as we can, the restrictions which embarrass our people in their efforts to exchange the fruits of their own toil which they do not need for the commodities of other countries which they do need. [Great applause, loud and prolonged.]

RELATIVE PRODUCTION, VALUE OF PRODUCT, AND EARNINGS OF A SPINNER USING HAND AND POWER MACHINERY.


INDUSTRY.	Year.	Description of unit.	Product of one spinner per week.		Earnings of one spinner per week.		Hours of labor per week.
			Amount.	Value.	Highest.	Lowest.	
Cotton yarn.....	1813	No. 10	Pounds. 3	\$2.25	60
Do.	1880	No. 10	3,000	450.00	\$9.30	\$7.20	60


RELATIVE PRODUCTION, VALUE OF PRODUCT, AND EARNINGS OF A WEAVER USING HAND AND POWER MACHINERY.


INDUSTRY.	Year.	Description of unit.	Production of one weaver per week.		Earnings of one weaver per week.		Hours of labor per week.
			Amount.	Value.	Highest.	Lowest.	
Cotton goods (shirting) ..	1813	No. 17½ (yarn)	Yards. 45	\$17.91	72
Do.	1880	No. 17½ (yarn)	1,440	108.00	\$8.00	\$4.00	60

NUMBER OF ESTABLISHMENTS, NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS, STEAM AND WATER POWER REDUCED TO HORSE-POWER.

INDUSTRY.	Number of establishments.	Number of employes.	Supplemented by steam and water power equal to horse-power below.	Reckoning six men to a horse-power, equal to men below.	Actual employes and horse-power reduced to employes.
Cotton goods.....	956	135,519	275,504	1,653,024	1,788,543
Flouring and grist mills.....	24,258	58,448	771,201	4,627,206	4,685,654
Iron and steel.....	781	77,555	397,247	2,383,482	2,461,037
Lumber, sawed.....	25,680	149,997	821,928	4,931,568	5,081,565
Paper.....	692	17,910	123,912	743,472	761,382
Woolen goods.....	1,984	77,870	106,507	639,042	716,912
Total	54,351	517,299	2,496,296	14,977,794	15,495,093







11067

Author Terrell, William G.

FcC

T325a

Title An appeal to the American people as a jury.

IR.71/144

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

